California Journal

THE MONTHLY REPORT OF STATE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Welfare, Medi-Cal Compromise

Court Reorganization Proposed

California's Democratic Party

Child Care Gets New Funds

Legislature Reconvenes

July - August 1971 in Review

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editor's Note

We were in New York and Philadelphia for a few days on *Journal* business recently. At least from the standpoint of state government, the "universal sense of powerlessness" that Reich describes so well in *The Greening of America* oppresses the spirit there nearly as much as the soggy East Coast summer.

Pennsylvania's fiscal crisis makes the budget and tax circus of California look like the epitome of rational decision-making. At least twice this year Pennsylvania has failed to meet state payrolls, and when we were there the legislature was in special session wrangling over how to raise taxes without being blamed for it. Yet, the enlightened citizenry of the state's largest city was only vaguely aware of what was going on in Harrisburg and, astonishingly, didn't appear concerned.

Both in Philadelphia and New York there was a feeling that what happened in their capitals was unknowable and certainly beyond the power of one individual's influence. The view of state politics there is rather like that of the ocean. Only an occasional fish breaking the surface hints at the activity that goes on beneath. And citizens feel they can no more move the Legislature than stop the tide. The reasons for this difference in perspective are complex. The cumbersome structure of government, the great power of political parties, the weight of established tradition are all part of it.

California government is not always the model of responsiveness or rationally, either, of course. But in California there is the feeling that, at least occasionally, one's actions as an individual do make a difference in our system of self-government; that the decision-making process is largely out in the open where it can be seen; that there is an openness to new ideas; that tomorrow won't necessarily be the same as today.

* * *

This month again several summer interns' articles appear that deserve recognition. Diane Friedman, a graduate of Davis, wrote the article on the Treasurer's Office, and Diane and Steve Rapaport, a graduate student in goverment at Sacramento State College, co-authored the article on intern programs. The article on court reorganization was wirtten by Beth Auerbach, a UCLA graduate who is going on to law school. Beth was in Sacramento this summer under the auspices of the Associated Students of the Uiversity of California Student Lobby.

* * *

We also wish to express appreciation to Robert Schelen, a student at Burbank High School, who assisted us faithfully in many ways on a volunteer basis this summer.

* * *

At about the same time that this issue is coming out, we are publishing *California Government and Politics Annual, 1971-72*. The *Annual* is designed as a supplementary text for use in introductory and advanced courses in government. It makes material from recent issues of the *Journal* available to the student market at a reduced cost. It is 76 pages in length and sells for $2.00.

California Journal

1108 O Street, Sacramento, California 95814
916/444-2840

EDITOR
Thomas R. Hoeber

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Jerome Evans

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
Judson Clark, William Geyer

CONTRIBUTORS
Jeffrey Davis, Thomas Jesse Goff Jr., Michael Wenstrom
Washington Correspondent: Lou Cannon
Counsel: Conrad Klein
Assistant to the Editor: Shirley Biondi
Subscription Manager: Gay Clark

California Journal/Quick Query Service
G. L. Sherwood, Director
916/444-0329

Southern California Representative
Robert Ramsay
750 S. Golden West Avenue
Arcadia, California 91006
213/446-8316 (Evenings)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Eugene C. Lee Chairman	Director, Institute of Governmental Studies Professor of Political Science Univ. of California, Berkeley
Houston Flournoy	Controller, State of California
Richard W. Gable	Chairman, Department of Political Science Associate Director, Institute of Governmental Affairs Univ. of California, Davis
Carma R. Leigh	State Librarian of California
Rus Walton	Writer
John Whelan	Professor of Law Univ. of California, Davis
Alan J. Wyner	Professor of Political Science Univ. of Calif., Santa Barbara

The interpretation and analysis of people and events in *California Journal* are not necessarily those of members of the Advisory Committee; they are not responsible for any articles, signed or unsigned, which appear in its pages.

July-August, 1971 Volume II, Number 7

Copyright 1971 by California Journal, 1108 "O" Street, Sacramento, California 95814; Judson Clark, President; Thomas R. Hoeber, Vice President; Jerome Evans, Treasurer; William Geyer, Secretary. Rates are based on membership of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Sacramento, California.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contents: July-August in Review

Legislature Returns to Confront Old Issues, New Deadlines 192

Taxes, school finance and reapportionment head the list of issues to be resolved in the remaining weeks of the session.

Tough Trading Breaks Executive-Legislative Deadlock on Welfare and Medi-Cal 193

Two weeks of tough, head-to-head bargaining produce compromises on welfare and Medi-Cal "reforms".

Major Court Reorganization Heads Toward Senate Showdown 196

An Assembly bill to consolidate the municipal, justice and superior courts attracts wide support but may have too many loose ends for passage this session.

Rural Subdivision Control Bills Move Ahead 199

A package of bills to halt premature subdivision of rural lands moves toward final hurdles after developers win some concessions.

Child Care Services Win New Funding and Encouragement 201

Consumer Groups Fight for Protective Legislation 203

California's Democratic Party: Organization, Leadership and Reform Proposals 205

Treasurer Guides State's Banking, Borrowing and Investing 208

State Land Management Agency Draws Public Attention 210

Student Interns Infiltrate Sacramento 212

Newsbriefs 216
People in the News 218
California Calendar 218
State Government Reports 219
Voting Record 220

Late last month consumer advocate Ralph Nader released three large volumes of a report entitled *Power and Land in California*. The report, researched for 15 months by a special 25-man California Task Force headed by Robert C. Fellmeth, is a sweeping indictment of state officials, legislators and private interests for acquiescence in the exploitation of California's natural resources. The report immediately drew a heavy counterattack from those so charged.

The editors of *California Journal* are still uncertain as to the depth and accuracy of the multitude of charges. But we are convinced that the report is of such significance that we plan to devote a sizeable portion of our space and resources in forthcoming issues to a careful analysis and evaluation, not only of the charges themselves, but also of the manner in which the Nader study was carried out and its potential impact on California government.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Legislature Returns to Confront Old Issues, New Deadlines

When the Legislature returned on Tuesday, September 7th, after a three-week recess, legislators faced a long agenda of unfinished business and a planned September 30 adjournment date, leaving little more than three weeks to complete their remaining tasks.

It is difficult to believe that they can make that deadline. None of the proposals for legislative or congressional districts has yet been drafted as a bill. Nor do the legislators appear to be close to agreement on such matters as tax legislation and public school support. However, if the Legislature does not conclude its business until after October 1st, an interesting technical problem will arise, as minority leader Bob Monagan has already suggested to the Democratic leaders.

Legal Complications

In order to allow for the filing of referendum petitions, the Constitution provides that statutory enactments cannot take effect until 60 days after final adjournment of the legislative session (unless an urgency clause, requiring a two-thirds vote, is added). Final adjournment follows a veto session, which may last one to five days. And finally, the veto session is preceded by a 30-day recess. The problem of prolonging the session past September 30th is that due to this time period of at least 91 days, 1971 statutory enactments may not actually take effect until after the 1972 Legislature convenes on January 3rd.

In an opinion issued to Monagan, Legislative Counsel George Murphy said: "Under such circumstances, 1972 bills to amend the 1971 statutory changes would be drafted and even conceivably passed, before the 1971 statutes takes effect." Although the prospect of this occurrence poses some technical problems, particularly for Murphy's office, which drafts bills for legislators, it is not likely to create a serious obstacle to an extended session.

A more serious deadline is November 6th, the date for passage of a reapportionment measure, so that prospective candidates can be assured of residing in the new districts for a one-year period before election, as required by the Constitution. According to the Legislative Counsel, the one-year residency requirement is "absolute." The Constitution, says Murphy, contains "no exception . . . for candidates in reapportionment years regardless of the date of passage of a reapportionment bill."

Unresolved Issues

While the work on reapportionment plans has been carefully underplayed by the legislative leadership of both houses, there is little doubt that it will become one of the most prominent issues for the remainder of the session. Only two remaining issues are likely to occupy equivalent attention: school finance and taxes. Legislative leaders have frequently voiced a commitment to provide new money for local school districts as well as relief for the property taxpayer. The first real test on these issues will determine whether there is enough support for the sizeable tax increase required to provide new money for schools and property tax relief, as well as make up the existing budget deficit. The prevailing sentiment may favor a more modest stopgap measure to keep the state out of debt for one more year.

However, the August 30th ruling by the State Supreme Court appears certain to give new urgency to those who have argued in favor of a large-scale increase in state aid, a statewide property tax, or both. The decision, which found the existing school finance system unconstitutionally discriminatory against children in poor districts, will undoubtedly give new life to an issue which had become moribund.

The major tax reform package authored by Assemblymen Joe Gonsalves and Bob Moretti, which includes money for schools, is currently awaiting a vote in the Assembly. In the Senate, competing tax proposals are still under consideration by the Senate Revenue and Taxation Committee. There are two major school finance bills: AB 144 by Assemblyman Leroy Greene has passed the Assembly; SB 129 by Senator Albert Rodda is awaiting a floor vote in the Senate.

Legislative Timetable

Resolution of the major issues of school finance and tax reform will largely determine the timetable for other pending legislation. The remaining volume of bills is impressive. To date, approximately 600 bills have been sent to the Governor's desk out of the total of 4,733 introduced. If the 1971 Legislature is going to equal the volume of enactments of prior years, another 1,500 bills can be expected to slide through the final stages of legislative action duirng the remaining weeks of the session.

There are 1,164 Assembly bills now pending in the Senate and 671 Senate bills in the Assembly. And there are still some bills, in addition to the tax and reapportionment measures, which have not yet been given favorable action by the house in which they originated, but which nevertheless have a chance for passage. Some of the major issues still pending are: social insurance benefits, minimum wage, state employees' and teachers' salary increases, farm labor relations, unemployment benefits for agricultural workers, no-fault automobile insurance, gas tax diversion, the creation of an environmental "super" agency, coastline regulation, air resources reorganization, real estate sales and subdivision controls, solid waste management, protective waterways, regional planning, environmental defense actions, trial court reorganization, ombudsmen for corrections, sex discrimination, lowering of the age of majority, landlord-tenant relations, low-cost housing programs, and job programs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tough Trading Breaks Executive-Legislative Deadlock on Welfare and Medi-Cal

The term "welfare reform" has been employed this year to describe almost any change in existing welfare laws no matter what direction it may take. It is not surprising, therefore, that nearly all parties to the compromises hammered out by the administration and Assembly leaders in August have hailed their product as major reform legislation. Governor Reagan said of the new legislation that "it is the most comprehensive . . . ever attempted anyplace in the United States." The compromise, he said "contains most of the tools we will need to control growth, reduce abuse and prosecute fraud. It achieves what we sought from the beginning." Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti, with somewhat greater restraint, said, "I think what all of us set out to do has been achieved." Assemblyman Bill Bagley, the Republican legislator most active in the negotiations, told reporters "We have done everything possible to reform welfare, save the state as much money as possible, and still feed the kids."

Uncertain Impact

Much of the probable impact of the new California laws is uncertain at this time, making it impossible to determine just how much has been accomplished by way of "reforming" welfare. But in this day when major proposals to rewrite welfare laws, and even to do away with welfare as it now exists, are being advanced on all sides, it is difficult to classify the compromise agreement as landmark legislation. Moreover, it is evident that the federal government is on the verge of making such sweeping changes in the form and content of public assistance that the state's actions will in any case be of little lasting significance.

It is, indeed, the fact of the compromise, and the willingness of both sides to bring it about, and to see it into law, which may be of greater importance. Prior to this summer, Democratic legislative leaders were generally convinced that the Governor would not and could not engage in the sort of head-to-head negotiation on major legislation which they deem to be at the heart of the legislative process. Reagan, for his part, had little reason to believe that the largely untried Democratic leaders were either interested in serious negotiations or capable of carrying out their end of any bargain by delivering a sufficient number of Democratic votes to secure enactment of a compromise agreement. Now that each side has learned more about the other, perhaps both can begin to deal more effectively with the several other major issues which remain to be decided at this session of the Legislature.

Medi-Cal Agreement

Although last to pass through the Legislature, amendments to the Medi-Cal program were the first to be worked out in executive-legislative negotiations. As announced on July 20th by Republican Assemblyman William Campbell, whose AB 949 was selected as the bill to carry the amendments, the principal features of the compromise were: a requirement that patients with $250 or more in savings could be charged $1 per visit by physicians; a ceiling on physicians fees of $5 per visit (down from $5.40); a requirement that beneficiaries pay 50 cents per prescription from their own funds; an eligibility revision to qualify every family of at least four persons with an annual family income of $5,000 or less; a $245 million ceiling on the maximum program cost to the counties ($25 million less than the counties might spend in the absence of the changes); and a one-year suspension of the state's authority to make across the board cuts in benefits.

According to Campbell, these provisions were to reduce state costs for Medi-Cal by $100 million annually, but by only about $65 million for 1971-72 because they could not go into effect until October 1st at the earliest. In his original proposal Governor Reagan sought cost reductions for the state of $124 million. The administration's figures had shifted several times, however, becoming a major source of irritation for Republicans and Democrats alike.

Demonstrating Moretti's ability to deliver Democratic votes once a compromise had been negotiated, AB 949 cleared the Assembly floor July 22nd, with a 66-10 vote. It became apparent, however, that the compromise itself was negotiable in several respects and that the swift Assembly action was gained by promises that the $5 figure for doctor's fees would be dropped and language added to assure that state participation in the financing will be "open-ended" — that is, if actual costs exceed the budgeted support, additional state funds will be provided to meet those costs.

The open-end provision (for both Medi-Cal and welfare) had been a major objective of representatives of county government all session. Arguing that when the state stops paying for a program it has started, the cost inevitably falls back on the counties, county officials have persuaded a majority of legislators from both parties that "closed-end" state funding is a false economy. The California Medical Association was similarly successful in convincing legislators that the proposed $5 physician's fee figure would be more likely to encourage cheating than to cut costs. Even Medi-Cal director Earl W. Brian agreed that doctors would probably just bill for more services and thus maintain their charges at the current standard.

(Continued on next page)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These two changes were adopted immediately in the Senate Health and Welfare Committee, where the bill was held for 13 days pending action on the compromise welfare bill. During this period representatives of the CMA and the County Supervisors Association tried hard to secure additional amendments, but neither group was successful, and as soon as a compromise was worked out for the welfare bill, AB 949 began moving again. It passed the Senate Health and Welfare Committee on a split voice vote August 9th and then went to Senate Finance Committee where two days later it was also passed by a voice vote, despite a bitter attack by Senator Stephen Teale, the Senate's only physician. That same day it was passed by the Senate 28-11. Assembly concurrence in the Senate amendments was obtained the following day, August 12th, with a 55-13 vote, and the bill then went to Governor Reagan for signing.

Welfare Negotiations

The welfare compromise was achieved with much greater difficulty than the Medi-Cal compromise, and more than once appeared doomed even to those most deeply involved in the negotiations. The negotiations began in earnest in the last week in July and extended

Principal Provisions of the Welfare and Medi-Cal Legislation

These are the most important provisions of the welfare legislation (SB 796) agreed upon by the Governor and legislative leaders:

1. Simplifies schedule of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) grants based upon family size and eliminates ceilings ("maximum participating base"). The new schedule is expected to somewhat increase grants for 80 per cent of AFDC recipients and reduce grants to the remainder, those with outside income.

2. Provides that the AFDC grant schedule shall be adjusted annually, beginning in 1973-74, according to the cost-of-living index.

3. Assures AFDC recipients the full cash value of federal food stamps if and when the federal government replaces such stamps with cash payments.

4. Tightens benefit standards by (a) halting state payments for unusual and non recurring special needs, (b) no longer-requiring welfare workers to seek maximum levels of assistance for each recipient, (c) precluding additional earned income exemptions for grant computations, (d) reducing the amount of aid granted before a recipient's eligibility is determined and requiring a determination within five days after such a grant, and (e) reducing exemptions for personal property in determining eligibility.

5. The state, instead of the counties, will have primary responsibility for eligibility and grant level determinations but may contract with the counties for this at state expense.

6. The state will pay all non-federal costs of aid to the blind and aged, but will reduce its share of aid to the disabled.

7. Tightens eligibility of dependent children over the age of 16.

8. Changes residency requirements by (a) terminating benefits to recipients who leave the state after 60 days rather than one year, (b) providing that a one-year residency requirement may be established by emergency decree when a county's unemployment rate reaches 6 percent, (c) requiring aliens to certify that they entered legally and plan to stay indefinitely.

9. Sets ceiling on earned income exemption in determining eligibility and need and reduces allowable "work-related expenses." Also requires counting of lump sum and irregular income and prorated income earned for eight or more months of the year.

10. Authorizes attachment of wages and property liens against absent parents of needy children and gives counties a greater share of payments collected from absent parents.

11. Require a wife's community property interest in the income of her children's stepfather be used for support of the children.

12. Increases support payment required of adult children of Old Age Security (OAS) recipients.

13. Appropriates $1 million for expanded family planning services.

14. Appropriates $3 million for expanded child care services.

15. Permits state welfare director access to state tax and other records to aid in eligibility determinations.

16. Extends counties' authority to recover overpayments of aid.

17. Increases work programs by (a) appropriating $2 million for increasing public service jobs under the Work Incentive Program, (b) appropriating $7 million to enable the State Personnel Board to increase job opportunities in state and local government, and (c) providing that an adult may lose his portion of an AFDC grant if he refuses to accept work, training or participation in a welfare work force.

18. Requires Director of Finance to approve expenditures for welfare above budgeted amount if caseloads or average payments exceed estimates.

The main features of the Medi-Cal bill (AB 949) as enacted into law are:

1. Extension of eligibility for Medi-Cal services to some 800,000 children and adults under 65 who are "medically needy" but not automatically eligible by being presently linked to welfare programs.

2. Division of benefits into "basic" and "supplementary" categories, with all supplementary services and other benefits *(e.g.,* more than four physician's visits per month or more than 24 per year and more than two drug prescriptions per month) requiring prior authorization by the state in other than emergency cases.

3. An increase in the powers of the Director of Health Care Services — including greater latitude in encouraging the development of prepaid group health plans.

4. A ceiling of $245 million on the counties' share of benefit and administrative costs under the program.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for nearly two weeks before a final agreement was reached. On the administration side the principal negotiators were the Governor and his Executive Secretary, Edwin L. Meese III, aided by Social Welfare Director Robert Carlson. On the legislative side, the participants included Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti, Democratic Assemblymen John Burton and Leo T. McCarthy, Republican Assemblyman William Bagley, and Democratic Senator Anthony Beilenson, author of the bill, SB 796, which became the vehicle for the compromise. The legislators also drew assistance from several top legislative aides.

According to Speaker Moretti, the welfare negotiations got started when he personally and in private told Governor Reagan that the two of them should sit down and start working out their differences on several major issues, setting aside their dislike for one another, if the Governor really wanted to resolve those issues. Another factor, clearly, was the Governor's announcement that he would block a late summer recess for the legislators, scheduled to begin August 2nd, by calling them back into session if there were no agreements on Medi-Cal and welfare by that time. Democratic leaders considered defying the Governor at this point, but quickly came to the conclusion that they, and especially Speaker Moretti, had more to gain by staying and attempting to negotiate with Reagan. In speech after speech throughout the state, Reagan and his top officials had made welfare and Medi-Cal the two most pressing issues of the legislative session.

The principle items at issue in the legislative-executive negotiations were continuance of the basic needs standards, provision for regular cost-of-living increases in AFDC benefits, open-end funding, and a guarantee that cash payments in lieu of federal food stamps would not be deducted from recipients' grants, all of which the Democrats wanted, and the tighter eligibility standards, fraud prevention measures, and lower maximum grants sought by the Governor.

Although the Governor himself began the negotiations, Ed Meese soon replaced him as the principal administration spokesman. Meese evidently had full authority to bargain in behalf of the Governor and gained the respect of legislative negotiators, a respect not shared by other administration participants, for his abilities and manner in carrying out the negotiations. Among other things, he was successful throughout the bargaining in convincing the legislators that the Governor really did want the negotiations to succeed.

On their side the several legislators, under Moretti's leadership, took turns pressing for their major points and trying to hold the negotiations together. At one time or another each of the legislators "blew up" over the intransigence of the administration — with the exception of Assemblyman McCarthy, who is given credit for keeping the negotiations going when everyone else had given up. After the first five days of bargaining, the Governor and Moretti announced that they had "agreed in concept on a total welfare package" and promised a bill for the Legislature to act upon by Monday, August 2nd. This announcement turned out to be somewhat premature, however, for in drafting the actual statutory language both sides found that their agreement did not hold together when spelled out in detail.

Toughest Issue

The negotiations were then resumed and it was not until a week later, on Friday, August 6th, that a final agreement was announced. According to participants, the toughest issue, right down to the last, was whether to retain the statutory schedule of basic need standards, which the Democrats insisted upon, or to substitute the Governor's "equitable apportionment" plan by which welfare grants might be scaled up or down every three months depending upon the balance of funds available for expenditure (see *California Journal*, March, 1971, Page 64). It was only when the Governor finally accepted retention of the needs standard, which legislative leaders by then did not expect, that the agreement was complete.

The compromise which emerged contained most of the major points for which each side had pushed hardest, other than the Governor's equitable apportionment plan. The Governor succeeded in getting a long list of anti-fraud controls, including the highly controversial power of the Department of Social Welfare to inspect recipients' state tax reports, plus increases in relatives' responsibility, reductions in special allowances, and certain administrative changes. Democratic legislators, who all along claimed that they wanted many of the anti-fraud controls sought by the Governor, also won provision for regular cost-of-living increases (but not until 1973-74), retention of the needs standards, open-end funding, plus a significant expansion in child care services, and $1 million for family planning services.

The compromise legislation moved swiftly through the Legislature, demonstrating once more, on the Assembly side, Speaker Moretti's ability to deliver the votes. The amended version of SB 797 passed the Assembly Ways and Means Committee on a split voice vote (after minor amendment) on the 10th of August and the next day passed the Assembly floor with a 62-9 vote. It then moved to the Senate, where earlier plans for a full committee hearing were dropped, and it was passed that same day with a 31-8 vote.

Despite the long list of new and amended provisions, California's welfare program seems very little changed. The philosophy and central provisions of the program remain intact and even the level of financing has been changed very little. According to the Legislative Analyst's last analysis of SB 796, estimated 1971-72 savings to the state will amount to only $35.2 million — as compared with the Governor's earlier hopes of reducing state welfare costs by as much as $220 million, of which at least one-third was to be obtained by legislative changes.

As he signed the new measures, Governor Reagan said he hoped that welfare and Medi-Cal would cease to be the emotional, partisan issues they had become. But he left an opening for himself when he also remarked that "there is still much to be done" in welfare.

On their side the Democrats, who express little pride in the legislation they helped to pass, hope that they have at least gained breathing room with regard to welfare so that more important changes can be considered in a less impassioned atmosphere.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Major Court Reorganization Proposal Heads Toward Senate Showdown

BY BETHAMI AUERBACH

The growing burden of backlogged court cases awaiting judicial decision threatens to collapse the legal system upon which we have grown so dependent. With a wary eye out for signs of the impending disaster, students of the legal system search frantically for solutions to the problems which beset our courts. This year there is before the Legislature a proposal to reorganize the trial courts which could go a long way toward solving at least some of the problems.

No major court reorganization has been undertaken in California for some twenty years. In 1947 the Legislature resolved that the Judicial Council, the administrative arm of the courts, should make a study of those courts inferior to the superior court. At that time there were six such tribunals — township justices' courts, city justices' courts, police courts, city courts, and two types of municipal courts. Because of the proliferation of these judicial bodies, there were frequent instances of overlapping or otherwise confused jurisdiction.

In its twelfth biennial report, the Council concluded that "the principal defect in our present inferior court system is the multiplicity of tribunals and their duplication of functions, a defect inherent in the court structure. . . . Unnecessary duplication of judicial functions should be eliminated and there should be both fewer courts and fewer types of courts."

Constitutional Amendment

The Council's report gave impetus to legislation to place a constitutional amendment before the voters, which they approved in 1950. The amendment decreased the number of these inferior tribunals from six to two, the municipal court and the justice court. The constitution required that the former be established in every judicial district with over 40,000 inhabitants, and the latter in those districts with 40,000 or fewer. The county boards of supservisors were given a great deal of latitude in organizing the judicial districts themselves and in setting the locations of the courts. (See *California Journal*, November 1970, for an overview of the California court system.)

While the reorganization of the early 1950's was a significant step toward streamlining the court structure, twenty years of population growth and mobility and vastly increased court filings have forced a reevaluation of the performance of the judicial system. To Assemblyman James Hayes the situation gives cause for growing concern: "I think no system in our free society is going to have more confrontation in the next decade than our legal system, and if we don't gear up to operate as efficiently and as effectively as possible, our whole system may break down." Hayes is an attorney and the author of the 1969 Family Law Act, which substituted "dissolution" for divorce and "irreconcilable differences" for the traditional grounds of blame or fault. Presently a member of the Assembly Judiciary Committee and its chairman in 1969 and 1970. Hayes is convinced of the necessity for wholesale restructuring of California's trial court system.

New Reform Proposed

Hayes' solution is a unification of the lower courts, an idea which was being discussed in the Assembly Judiciary Committee as early as 1967. In 1968 it was the subject of hearings at which the principal witnesses were Ralph Kleps, the Administrative Director of the Courts, and Legislative Analyst A. Alan Post. Last year Hayes submitted a skeletal bill and a constitutional amendment which erased all references to municipal and justice courts in those sections of the Constitution dealing with the courts. He also headed an Assembly Interim Committee on Judiciary which studied the single trial court plan for court reorganization and which held hearings in September 1970. At the end of that legislative session, Hayes, the staff of the Assembly Judiciary Committee, and the Legislative Counsel's office drafted AB 1400, AB 1401, AB 2743, and ACA 45, an ambitious and far-reaching package which Hayes introduced in March 1971. It is aimed at consolidating California's three trial courts into one and also seeks to make major changes in the areas of court administration, financing, and personnel.

AB 1400 abolishes the municipal and justice courts, so that in each county there exists one trial court, the superior court, which is to be divided into various divisions. Municipal court judges are elevated to the superior court, while justice court judges (some of whom are not attorneys) become magistrates of the superior court.

There are several efficiency-increasing features of such a unified court plan. First of all, many problems

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of jurisdiction and venue are eliminated. The proposal also provides for judges to ride circuit in counties where there is only enough judicial business to occupy them on a part-time basis. Hayes also believes that functional subdivision of the superior courts will allow the judge to develop expertise in a particular field, so that he may decide cases with increased insight and dispatch.

Opposition

The principle of court consolidation is generally considered to be a progressive one and has found supporters throughout the legal profession. For example, in a statewide poll sponsored by the Century City Bar Association, 60% of the attorneys questioned favored consolidation. However, the Special Judicial Reform Committee of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, in its report of February, 1971, recommended that "no further consideration be given to the consolidation of Superior and Municipal Courts." The report lists seven reasons for the committee's non-support, including administrative and financial arguments among them.

The board of trustees of the Los Angeles County Bar Association, however, disapproved of this recommendation on the grounds that the structure of the trial courts required further study.

Hayes called the superior court judges' recommendation "not only poorly timed but ill considered." In a letter to Superior Court Judge Malcolm L. Lucas, Chairman of the Special Judicial Reform Committee, Hayes explained the cause of his disappointment:

> I am sure you and the very competent committee members were aware that this subject has been of continuing interest to me and was carefully analyzed at a meeting of the State Bar held in Los Angeles last year. It is significant to me that neither you nor any of the Judges on your committee either asked to testify at that open committee hearing, nor did any of you come forward to testify when I asked during the progress of the hearing.
>
> I have spent the past eight months working with members of my staff and others in putting together a responsible proposal for court reorganization to meet the supreme challenges of this last quarter of the 20th century. . . . This measure for massive reform is one that you and your committee and all other Judges should seriously consider *after* you have examined it and not based on some guess work as to what it may contain.

Probably the most strenuous objection of the superior court judges is concealed in the most subtle of the seven points on their list of objections: they want to retain the municipal court as a training ground for less qualified and less experienced judges. The superior court judges, then, are concerned with the elusive, intangible idea of prestige and with the much more concrete one of being faced with the prospect of trying small claims or traffic cases. Hayes anticipated this objection, and AB 1401 makes a concession to these judges: in counties with more than five superior court judges, small claims cases are to be heard only by those judges on the bench for fewer than five years, or by magistrates, commissioners, or referees.

The court consolidation package still has operational difficulties and unresolved ambiguities, however. It now provides that the appellate division of the superior court, for example, will hear appeals from other divisions of the same court. This could cause knotty problems, especially in the extreme case of a one-judge court.

Circuit riding, an important feature of the Hayes package, also raises problems. At present, for instance, if a person is arrested in a small community on a bailable felony offense, the local justice of the peace is available to set bail. When the justice court judge becomes a magistrate under AB 1400, no provision is made to empower him to hear felony arraignments. In this way, a situation may arise in which a court must act quickly when the traveling judge is elsewhere on the circuit. This problem can be avoided by amending the section of AB 1400 which sets down the jurisdiction and powers of magistrates, but it is this type of difficulty which, justifiably or not, concerns legislators from the less populated counties. Many of them want to guard the existence of the justice courts. Senator Cologne of Riverside County, for example, has introduced SB 619, a less sweeping alternative, which would abolish the municipal courts but retain the justice courts.

Revenue Implications

In the Hayes package, court unification means not only consolidation but centralization in administration and financing. AB 1400 transfers the costs of trial court operation to the state. At present, the counties bear most of these costs, while the state provides a portion of the superior court judges' salaries and contributes to the judges' retirement funds. The Legislative Analyst reports that the counties spent $100,881,271 to run the three trial courts in fiscal 1969-1971, not counting expenditures on probation, district attorneys, and public defenders. Offsetting these costs are the fees, fines, forfeitures, and penalty assessments collected by the courts. These are divided according to a formula between the counties and the cities; the counties received $70,652,023 in this manner in fiscal 1969-1970.

Under Hayes' plan, these monies will flow into the State Court Fund; since the counties are to be relieved of the costs of court operation, they will also be relieved of this source of revenue. Clearly, however, the measure is of net financial benefit to them, and Hayes reports that he has not encountered resistance to his proposals on the parts of boards of supervisors.

Cities Share

The cities opposed the court reorganization plan of the early 1950's because the then six inferior tribunals provided them with a healthy source of revenue. To win their approval the plan was changed to allow the cities to keep a substantial portion of court revenues.

This year the cities again chafed at the prospect of losing their revenues under the Hayes proposal, and it has also been amended to retain a share for them. Whatever the merits of this tactic, the result is to perpetuate the 1950 deal, a situation whose general benefit from the start was questionable at best.

(Continued on next page)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AB 1400 provides for uniform statewide superior court filing fees in civil actions. Existing fees, fixed at various levels, will all be raised to conform with those in effect in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. This will provide additional revenue to the State Court Fund. Hayes, however, believes the real cost reductions will come not from any such revenue-raising measures but instead from the more efficient use of judges. He feels that under the present system the only "solution" to the added workload is to increase indefinitely the number of superior court judges and along with them, the costs of the trial courts. Los Angeles County, he remarks, has a pending request for twenty-three additional superior court judges at a total cost of $8,050,000. In the face of continually rising court filings and increased litigation, however, it is doubtful that the single trial court could in one sweep eliminate the need for additional superior court judgeships. But by using judges more efficiently, it does offer the prospect that fewer new judgeships will need to be created each year.

It is Hayes' plan that a centrally administered court system would bring with it the elimination of local disparities and that uniformity, for instance, in forms of pleadings, would expedite court operation. The administration of the trial court system is transferred to the state and to the Judicial Council in particular. A council staff member expressed his feeling, however, that while the package substantially broadens the authority and responsibilities of the council, concomitant increases in staffing and financing necessary for capable administration of the system are not fully prescribed in statute. He is also concerned that the bills provide no steps for a gradual transition to state administration.

The third major area of interest in Hayes' proposals deals with personnel. Currently, the function of bailiff is discharged by the constable's office in the justice court, by the marshal's office in the municipal court, and by the sheriff's office in the superior court. AB 1400 and ACA 45 provide for a statewide marshal's office, to be the administrative force which will perform all bailiff duties. The sheriffs will then be relieved of their court-related responsibilities and will be free to devote added time and manpower to combatting crime.

Hayes' proposals also give the courts and judges more voice in the selection of their personnel. The Judicial Council may appoint officers, attaches, and other employees only with the consent of the presiding judge of the superior court, and he may assign them to a particular court only with the approval of the judge involved. Hayes feels that this provision will reinforce the central position of the judge in his own court and make for a smoothly functioning group within the courtroom. A source close to the Judicial Council expressed the feeling that the plan for a centrally operated state marshal's office would be more consistent if the marshal also were designated by the council rather than appointed by the Governor.

More Study Wanted

Ralph Kleps, director of the Administrative Office of the Courts and executive officer to the Judicial Council, says that the council has asked Hayes to defer his bills until next year's legislative session. The Judicial Council will itself receive two reports this year on California's beleaguered court system covering basically the same area as the Hayes legislation. According to Kleps, "the Council reports will not necessarily lead us to the same conclusions about court reform that are demonstrated in the bills by Assemblyman Hayes."

The first of the studies, begun in February and March under a federal grant by Booz, Allen and Hamilton of San Francisco, will be released September 15th. It will treat the problem of municipal and justice courts in California. The second report, not due until December, will probe California's superior and appellate courts.

Any meaningful reforms, Kleps believes, including the Hayes legislative package, will also require constitutional amendments that cannot be voted on until the general election in Fall of 1972. "It seems foolish," says Kleps, "to pass legislation at this time."

Herb Nobriga, Consultant to the Assembly Judiciary Committee and an admirer of Hayes' "genius" in pushing for court reform says the Judicial Council study is "jerry-built . . . in order to have the bill tabled until a later date, despite five years of not only notice that the bill was to be introduced but participation in the hearings that led to its introduction."

Hayes' package was approved by the Assembly on July 22 by a vote of 55-18 on the three bills and 54-19 on the constitutional amendment. It received bipartisan support, including an enthusiastic introduction by Majority Floor Leader Walter Karabian who hailed the proposals as "the most important and historic this legislature has ever considered since the people adopted Articles 6 and 22 of the Constitution of California."

The bills face a difficult course in the Senate, however. Frequently, measures which propose to make major changes in state laws must be submitted and resubmitted for several years before the details can all be refined, and clearly these bills still have "details" to be worked out. Nevertheless, Hayes is determined to wage a vigorous battle for early approval. His optimism has been reinforced by Assembly victory in the face of predictions that the package would never leave the Assembly Ways and Means Committee.

Hayes obviously feels that the time for innovation is long overdue: "Our present system is functioning like a 1925 automobile," he remarks, noting that 1925 was the year in which the municipal courts were established. "We are trying to function in 1971 with a 1925 model car. I am attempting to make a 1980 automobile."

It is not yet certain that 1971 will be the year of the Court Consolidation Act. But it is equally clear that the idea of a single trial court is an enduring rather than a transitory one.

Back Copies of the JOURNAL

Copies of *California Journal* beginning with the first issue, January 1970, may be purchased for $1.00 each plus postage and handling. Enclose payment with your order and we'll cover the mailing costs. Address orders to California Journal, 1108 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rural Subdivision Control Bills Move Ahead

Ralph Nader's latest broadside, *Power and Land in California*, is certain to arouse renewed public attention to problems of land use in California. But even prior to the release of the Nader report land use regulation proposals ranked behind only welfare, Medi-Cal, and taxation among the most important issues before the 1971 session of the California Legislature.

Sharing the spotlight this session with legislation to preserve the California coastline are a series of proposals designed to inhibit the indiscriminate development of rural subdivisions. Until recently, control of such developments, frequently characterized as "premature" subdivisions, was almost entirely the responsibility of local government. In 1969, however, the Legislature segregated these subdivisions from other types of developments by defining them as "land projects," a term covering parcels containing 50 or more unbuilt lots sold by specified promotional methods and located at least two miles from a community with 1,500 or more voters.

The 1969 Land Project Act subjected these developments to regulation by the State Real Estate Commissioner's office similar to that applied to the sale of out-of-state lands. However, the act, primarily a response to complaints of fraud in the sale of remote lots, did not focus directly upon the environmental consequences of such developments. Statutory responsibility in this area remained with county governments under a rather vague mandate in the Subdivision Map Act (first codified in 1943) to control "design" and "improvements" in the approval of specific subdivision proposals.

McCarthy Bills

The center of the controversy this year has been a package of five bills, AB 1300-1304, by San Francisco Assemblyman Leo McCarthy. McCarthy served as chairman of a lower house subcommittee which held a series of hearings on the problem last winter *(California Journal*, December 1970, pp. 353-4). His bills propose several new consumer protection devices, but their primary objective is to strengthen local controls over proposed rural subdivisions, including the power to prohibit them for environmental reasons.

When first introduced, the bills were opposed by a coalition of developer interests led by the newly-formed Western Developers Council (composed largely of second-home developers) and the California Real Estate Association. McCarthy was able to steer the package of bills through the Assembly despite this joint opposition, and then successfully split the coalition by agreeing to a series of amendments which caused Western Developers to withdraw their opposition prior to hearing in the Senate Local Government Commitee. All except one of the bills, AB 1304, have now cleared their initial hurdle in the Senate, but three, AB 1300, 1302 and 1303, still must be approved by the powerful Finance Committee, and the CREA is reportedly attempting to martial additional support for an attempt to stop a fourth bill (AB 1301) on the Senate Floor. The Senate, meanwhile, has sent a mild reform bill sponsored by the Western Developers Council, SB 292 (Walsh), to the Assembly, where it awaits an uncertain fate.

Consumer Protection

The principal consumer protection device is contained in AB 1300, which originally gave the Real Estate Commissioner the power to refuse to issue a project report, and thereby to prohibit proposed land projects, if he determined that the sale price is not "fair, just and equitable" to the purchaser. The commissioner has this power in regard to the sale of out-of-state lands in California, but the Department of Real Estate and a variety of land interests charged that its application to California land is tantamount to price control and succeeded in getting McCarthy to amend out direct price considerations and to substitute a very general review as to the "reasonableness" of the subdivision financing and the future financial burden for buyers.

A second provision of AB 1300 is intended to clear up ambiguities in the 48-hour rescission right currently granted to purchasers under the Land Project Act. McCarthy's bill offers the purchaser a 14-day "cooling off" period from the time he signs a sales contract. This is a stronger protection than that contained in the Senate bill, SB 292 (Walsh), which provides only a 48-hour rescission clause, beginning at the time the contract is signed, unless the purchaser has not seen the property, in which case a 14-day rescission right applies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUBDIVISIONS *(Continued from previous page)*

AB 1301 grants local jurisdictions expanded powers to review and deny subdivisions on the basis of economic and environmental considerations. The bill proposes the application of seven specific grounds for denial, generally environmental in nature, and requires local governing bodies to deny proposed subdivisions when they find these grounds exist. In contrast to AB 1301, Senator Walsh's SB 292 expands the grounds for denial but makes such denial optional, even when there is a finding that a proposed subdivision will create "substantial adverse environmental effect."

Originally AB 1301 also included a highly controversial provision listing an oversupply of existing unimproved lots as one of the grounds for disapproval of a subdiivsion. This provision was the last vestige of a bill introduced by Senator Walsh last year (SB 395) which would have required a 50 percent "build-out" in five years for all subdiivsions. Developers objected to the unimproved lot inventory concept in AB 1301, complaining that it would force local government into the position of granting a monopoly to the earliest developers in each area, and that the sins of previous developers would be unfairly visited on other landowners who wished to develop their land. If AB 1300 and 1301 were both to pass, the argument continued, local governments would be in the interesting position of exercising supply control over undeveloped lots while the state holds the lid on lot prices in new land projects. McCarthy's Senate amendments eliminated this objection by deleting consideration of the number of unimproved lots as a basis for subdivision approval as well as the controversial "fair, just and equitable" language.

Apply to All Subdivisions

Even with this change, enactment of the new law is far from assured. AB 1301 and a related measure, AB 2381 (Arnett) have generated greater opposition from nearly all segments of the real estate and development industries because their provisions apply to all subdivisions, and not merely to those classified as land projects. AB 2381, which was introduced by Assemblyman Dixon Arnett at the request of the Resources Agency, also would have broadened the definition of subdivision "design" to include general environmental considerations, and required a two-thirds vote by planning commissions for approval of any subdivision map. Arnett's bill was killed in the Assembly Committee on Planning and Land Use, which had previously cleared the McCarthy package.

An even more comprehensive proposal in this area is carried in AB 1375 (Wilson) which substantially rewrites the Subdivision Map Act. The product of three years of intensive work by a joint League of California Cities-County Supervisors Association task force, the bill would correct a multitude of procedural snarls, as well as making major substantive changes. In addition to broadening the powers of local governments to disapprove subdivisions on environmental grounds, one controversial section of the bill enlarges upon the present Quimby Act requirement for park site dedication, imposing additional requirements on a subdivider for the provision of public facilities such as school and fire station sites.

AB 1375 reached the Assembly floor, but will probably ultimately be consigned to further study with the aquiescence of its sponsors, who had previously set 1972 as the target for its enactment. Present opponents of AB 1301 argue that it should receive similar scrutiny, or that at least its application should be restricted to land projects, but McCarthy has thus far avoided such an amendment.

State Assistance

The two additional bills in the McCarthy package give local authorities improved access to state records and expertise in considering subdivision applications (AB 1302) and require cities and counties to comply with criteria and guidelines for local general plans adopted by the Council on Intergovernmental Relations (AB 1303). However, a provision authorizing the withholding of state gas tax funds from local governments which are not in compliance has been deleted in the Senate.

McCarthy's final measure, AB 1304, imposes a five percent tax on the value of each land project lot at the time of sale. Amended in Assembly Ways and Means to make the tax a local prerogative rather than a statewide requirement, the bill will go directly to the Senate Floor (and not to Senate Finance) should it clear the Senate Revenue and Taxation Committee. AB 1304 has been vigorously opposed by developers as a discriminatory tax and a bad precedent. Complicating matters is the fact that the amendments to make the tax a local option, which allow the bill to bypass the Senate Finance Committee, also generate concern on the part of conservationists by offering local governments an incentive for subdivision approval.

The policy question raised by the McCarthy bills boils down to just how much authority the Legislature is ready to grant to either state or local governments to regulate rural subdivisions. Local authorities have been explicit in their requests for stronger controls, but conservationists and others remain distrustful of the local will to exercise such powers. Consumer groups and conservationists have decried the lack of both state and local law which would acknowledge the community's need for intelligent land use. Developers, on the other hand, contend that present law meets most major public requirements, and they are particularly shy of legislation that would switch land planning controls from local agencies to state authorities.

The Nader report, which leveled one of its many blasts in the direction of rural subdivisions, introduced no new issues of substance on this much-debated subject. The timing of its release, however, may provide some added impetus for McCarthy in his attempt to push his package through the Senate when the Legislature reconvenes after Labor Day — providing that Nader's broad swipes at the Legislature itself do generate a countervailing backlash in the capitol.

NO-FAULT INSURANCE UPHELD

No-fault auto insurance was found constitutional by the Massachusetts' Supreme Court. In the case of *Pinnick vs. Cleary*, the court ruled against Milton Pinnick who claimed his right to sue was violated by the 1970 no-fault law which prohibits suits over "pain and suffering" unless medical expenses exceed $500. The law also requires bodily injury claims under $2,000 to be paid by the policyholder's own insurer regardless of fault in the accident. No-fault laws have also been enacted by Delaware, Florida, and Puerto Rico.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Child Care Services Win Wide Support, $3 Million New State Funding

BY RUTH PRITCHARD

An $18 million statewide network of child care centers will result from an all but overlooked piece of California's new welfare reform law, setting the stage for a dramatic expansion of child care services throughout the state. The law directs each of the state's 58 counties to provide child care services for "former, current, and potential recipients of public assistance" who agree to "accept or maintain employment or training" and who certify that they could not do so without child care services. The counties are specifically authorized to contract with public or private agencies to provide these child care services. And although the counties are also authorized to charge a fee for this service, the new law appropriates $3 million in new state support, which will in turn generate up to $1.5 million in county funding and $13.5 million in federal support — a total of $18 million.

There are two objectives behind this action. First, most educators and many legislators are now convinced that early child care can provide important learning opportunities for all children, and especially for those children who otherwise receive little early educational stimulation. Second, it is obvious that few women with children can be expected to get off the welfare rolls, and into continuing employment or job training, without some provision for the care of their children while they are absent from the home.

In the past, the emphasis has been upon child care as a convenience to working mothers — first in the 19th century settlement houses and later, on a much larger scale, during World War II, when hundreds of thousands of mothers went to work on the assembly lines. This point has now been picked up by those who argue that a large percentage of mothers who now receive grants under Aid to Families with Dependent Children could enter the state's working force if care were provided for their children. And it has become a major theme of the women's liberation movement which sees extensive child care services as essential to the economic "liberation" of women.

Working Mothers

Women now comprise 37 percent of the total work force in the state. The final 1970 census figures for California are not yet published, but it is known that there have been 700,000 divorces in the state in the last 10 years, 60 percent of them involving children under 18. As a consequence, at least one in ten families is headed by a woman, and the number is increasing. Add to this the number of women who are widowed or separated, the married women who work because their husbands are unemployed, low-paid or handicapped, and women who simply want to work for professional fulfillment and the extent of the need for child care begins to become clear. There are now at least 2.5 million children in California with working mothers.

A woman with young children who is employed full-time needs more than eight hours of child care, five days a week, to cover travel and working time. In most cases the child care must be low in cost, since women, apart from a limited number of professionals, still fill the lowest paying jobs in the economy.

Existing Programs

Child care in California takes many forms, ranging from simple babysitting by the woman next door to full-scale preschool educational programs operated by the public school districts. In between there are private home facilities, day nurseries and parent cooperatives. Among the publicly licensed or sponsored services, some are supervised by the Department of Education and some by the Department of Social Welfare.

Those under the Department of Education include:

- California Children's Centers operated by school districts to provide a comprehensive array of day care and educational programs. These centers were begun in 1943 and received a major stimulus in 1965-67 when federal aid became available on a 75/25 federal and state sharing basis. This year 22,000 children from two to fourteen years old were enrolled at 324 Children's Centers for day care and a formal education program for up to eleven hours daily. Social and health services are also provided.
- Migrant child care summer programs which this summer provided day care for approximately 100 infants and compensatory education for approximately 1000 preschool children at 25 rural sites.

Those under the Department of Social Welfare include:

- Family day care homes licensed by county welfare departments. Approximately 48,000 children are being cared for in 12,000 such homes with up to six children in each home.
- Private day nurseries operated on either a profit or nonprofit basis to serve children aged two to seven whose parents can afford to pay weekly fees of up to $30 per child. The nonprofit day

(Continued on next page)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nurseries are operated by churches, parent cooperatives and other nonprofit groups funded by United Fund contributions or other sources and are licensed by the State Department of Social Welfare. As of January 1971, there were more than 2,200 licensed private day nurseries serving 16,500 children in full-day programs and almost twice that many in half-day programs.

Additional programs are operated by the Department of Education but do not provide full day care. These include:

- State preschool education programs which serve more than 14,000 disadvantaged children between the ages of three and five at 143 locations. These are compensatory education programs in "target" areas of economic and educational deprivation. They take children for up to four hours per day and stress social services and parent involvement as well as early education.
- Head Start, parent-participation, adult education preschool programs. Head Start programs are operated by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The school district preschool programs financed from compensatory education funds have provided very valuable experience in early schooling for children of low income families.

Taken all together, formal full-day child care facilities of all types, including those under the Department of Education and those licensed by Social Welfare, provide space for 125,000 children. Proponents of expanded services for low income families compare this figure with the reported 175,000 children of welfare recipients and another 350,000 children of former or potential welfare recipients listed by the Department of Social Welfare as needing child care.

The city of Los Angeles is often cited as an example of what happens when the supply falls so far short of the need. The 76 children's centers there have carried a total of more than 12,000 names on their waiting lists for the last three years. Obviously a great many children pass the preschool years without getting in.

Federal Aid Increased

In the next few years it is believed that three to seven billion dollars of federal funds will be made available nationally to establish child care centers under 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act. Federal standards specifically require: one adult for every five children, with academic degrees for supervisors; educational opportunities appropriate to the ages of the children; parental involvement; health and nutritional provisions, and an adequate plant and equipment. California's expanding statewide system will have to meet those standards in order to gain additional federal support, and this is the intent of the child care provisions of the new welfare reform law. In general the objective of the new state law is to make the provisions of the 1967 federal legislation operative throughout the state.

Under the Umbrella

Last year, California moved part way in this direction in attempting to consolidate and strengthen existing child care services by assigning overall supervision to the Department of Education. AB 750, authored by Assemblyman Jerry Lewis, placed an interagency umbrella over all group child care programs, with administration in hands of the Department of Education and supportive health and social services to be provided by the Department of Social Welfare under a cooperative agreement. The impetus behind this legislation was the fact that the state had lost millions of dollars in federal funds both because of a failure to apply for funds and, in the welter of public and private child care facilities, because of a failure to conform to federal eligibility standards. The legislation left several points unclear, however, and the Department of Education does not yet administer all of the programs for which it was given authority. In this situation the Department of Social Welfare, which receives the federal money for child care, is reluctant to sign the implementing contracts with the Department of Education necessary to bring day nurseries under the umbrella.

Assemblyman Lewis has an amendment to last year's bill in a current bill, AB 2554, which clarifies the Department of Education's administrative authority for day nurseries which receive public funds, but leaves other types of child care, such as family day care homes, under the licensing authority of county welfare departments.

Welfare Prevention Act

The child care provisions in the new welfare reform package (originally introduced by Assemblyman John Miller as AB 23) are intended to require counties to extend child care services to all families who are welfare recipients or who might become recipients without such services. In the past, many counties have refused to serve children from families which were not then on welfare. The new law clears California of the threat of a federal nonconformity issue by providing that services will now be statewide as required by federal regulations. The state will also give direct aid to the counties by assuming two-thirds of the non-federal cost.

It is unclear at the moment, however, what effect the new legislation will have on last year's effort to consolidate state administration of child care. This will be an important issue to be decided when new regulations covering the welfare reform child care funds are written and implementing contracts are drawn.

The problem with the new law arises from the wording that "each county in cooperation with the department (Social Welfare), the Department of Human Resources Development, and the Department of Education shall . . . establish a child care training program . . ." and that each county "may contract with other public or private entities to provide child care services." If these programs are to be administered by the Department of Education, as required by the 1970 law, regulations and implementation contracts under the welfare reform program must make clear how county programs relate to the Department of Education's administrative authority.

(Continued on page 215)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Consumer Groups Come Together To Fight for Protective Legislation

Consumers' efforts to win passage of strong protective legislation have all too often been rendered ineffective by the emotional rhetoric of fragmented consumer interests and lack of a well-financed lobbying operation in Sacramento. This year, however, organizations devoted to consumer causes have formed an alliance to "promote consumerism as a political issue."

Organized early in the session by a network of California-based groups, the Consumer Coalition is the first organization to lobby in Sacramento directly for the consumer. It has focused chiefly on supplying legislators with a realistic picture of consumer problems, documentation of abuses, and a feeling for what it sees as the critical need for specific corrective action. Lacking the financial support and organizational machinery characteristic of business and corporate interests, the coalition is nevertheless able to present a unified voice to the Legislature through its lobbyist, James Reed, a former consultant to the Assembly Judiciary Committee. Reed, for one, is confident the new coalition can succeessfully establish consumerism as a legislative priority.

Organizations forming the coalition are the Association of California Consumers, the California Farmer-Consumer Information Committee, Consumers Cooperatives of Berkeley and Palo Alto, the California Home Economics Association, and the NAACP. Organized labor's representatives are the United Auto Workers and the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union.

CC's maiden legislative program has included support for several very ambitious consumer reform measures, and many of its bills have failed in the face of overwhelming industry opposition. But several freshmen and veteran legislators have augmented the ranks of traditional consumer advocates among lawmakers, and a number of important bills are now approaching passage.

No-Fault Insurance

Heading the list of controversial consumer bills is the automobile insurance reform proposal known as "no-fault" insurance, modeled after the Massachusetts statute which became effective this year. The plan would require a victim's insurance company to immediately pay damages and medical expenses resulting from an automobile accident, regardless of whose fault the accident was, and all licensed drivers would be required to purchase no-fault coverage.

The concept is favored by insurance companies but opposed strenuously by the California Trial Lawyers Association. Proponents argue that a no-fault system will reduce bodily injury auto liability costs and provide for the immediate settlement of claims, eliminating the need for court action in the majority of cases. Opponents emphasize the need for a nationwide plan, since a person injured in an out-of-state accident would still have to sue to collect a claim, and contend the system would unduly restrict a claimant's right to achieve a proper settlement.

Of several no-fault bills introduced, only AB 1505 by Assemblyman Jack Fenton is still alive. It establishes a mandatory system of motor vehicle liability insurance providing up to $10,000 per person per accident for medical and other expenses resulting from accidental bodily injury. The bill has passed the Assembly and is awaiting action by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Auto Repairs

Legislation to deal effectively with the problems of excessive automobile repair costs and questionable dealer practices is moving successfully toward enactment this year. Senator Anthony Beilenson's SB 51 and AB 1398 by Assemblyman Frank Murphy require registration of automobile repair dealers in an attempt to reduce fraudulent, excessive, or unfair car repair practices. The measures also require dealers to disclose certain costs and to list any used part installed in a customer's car. Dealers conducting unauthorized repairs, making misleading statements, or rendering invoices for work done in excess of authorized estimates are subject to license revocation and prosecution.

A Bureau of Automotive Repair within the Department of Motor Vehicles is to be established to regulate repair shops, registered or not, and a nine-member advisory board with four representatives from the automobile repair industry is set up to oversee industry practices and bureau regulations.

AB 1398 passed the Assembly last month; SB 51 is on the Senate floor for a vote. Earlier in the session, a proposal by Senator Tom Carrell to license auto mechanics was defeated.

Attempts to halt the selling of drivers' license and motor vehicle registration records by the Department of Motor Vehicles failed again this year. A leading proponent of closing DMV files, Assemblyman William Campbell, introduced AB 592 to prohibit the sale, dissemination, or public inspection of DMV records and lists prepared by the DMV containing the names and addresses of drivers. Insurance companies and collection agencies, heavy users of such information, are among business interests who oppose restricted access to driver's files.

Another measure opposed bitterly by industry proposes to abolish auto sales deficiency judgments. AB 620 by Assemblyman Henry Waxman is currently

(Continued on next page)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before the Senate Judiciary Committee, which killed a similar bill last year. The bill outlaws suits to collect a deficiency balance on a motor vehicle sales contract when the automobile is repossessed after default in payment. Under present California law, only car dealers may sue for a deficiency judgment. The practice was outlawed for other retailers in 1963.

Retail Credit and Sales

A comprehensive revision of credit card practices would result from the passage of Senator Alfred Song's SB 97, now awaiting a vote on the Assembly floor. Aimed at reducing unresolved or neglected computer billing errors, it requires a credit card issuer to correct billing errors within 60 days of being notified by a cardholder, or forfeit the amount of the bill. Song's legislation also prohibits certain credit card practices, such as dissemination of false credit information or an unfavorable credit report during a billing dispute, and outlaws discrimination on the basis of race, sex, and other grounds in the issuance of credit cards.

Existing credit and collection practices, under fire by consumers at every recent legislative session, are still intact despite efforts by several assemblymen to prohibit certain methods of collecting debts. Assemblymen Bill Greene and Bob Monagan each carried bills to prevent a creditor from indiscriminately communicating with a debtor's employer in attempting to secure payment. Both were defeated.

One strong Assembly measure making various consumer debt collection practices unlawful still awaits action by the Senate Judiciary Committee. Authored by Assemblyman Bill Greene, AB 2073 prohibits a collector from sending a debtor any communication simulating a legal document, threatening to take action he does not intend to initiate, or threatening to enforce a right which does not in fact exist.

Efforts to reduce interest rates on installment accounts have not been successful this year. Senator Alfred Alquist's legislation reducing the monthly interest rate to one percent failed to get out of committee, and Assemblyman Alan Sieroty's bill establishing maximum finance charges for credit card transactions was referred for possible interim study. A third measure by Senator George Moscone, setting a maximum interest rate of 12 percent per year, applicable to all credit sales, was also referred for study.

No bill to ban or restrict door-to-door selling was introduced this year, but the Governor has signed AB 289 (Fenton) to protect buyers against dubious door-to-door sales offers. The new law permits a buyer to cancel a home solicitation sales contract for goods or services at any time if the contract fails to advise the buyer of his right to cancel and the seller fails to provide a cancellation form. If these conditions have been compiled with, a buyer has until midnight of the third day, excluding Sundays, to cancel the contract.

Complaints about mail order transactions and nondelivery or delayed delivery of goods may be substantially reduced by two bills requiring the shipment of merchandise ordered by mail within a specified time period. Assemblywoman March Fong's AB 2316 requires that within six weeks of receiving an order, a mail order business must deliver the goods, make a full refund, send a letter of explanation to the purchaser, or substitute merchandise of comparable value. AB 2296 (Waxman) also imposes a six week time limit on filling an order, and requires mail order businesses operating within the state to post a $20,000 performance bond with the Secretary of State. A purchaser who sustains injury may recover damages under the bond. Both Fong's and Waxman's measures have been passed by the Assembly.

Packaging and Labelling

The perennial death of the unit pricing concept carried by Senator Beilenson and Assemblyman Mike Cullen had at least one positive aspect this session. Beilenson's bill, requiring the price per unit of weight to be displayed on a commodit's label, was referred for interim study.

Cullen's AB 70 originally provided for standardization of food packages into specified weight categories. It was amended to require only that the quantity declaration on a food package give the metric equivalent, and lost the support of the Consumers Coalition. The bill was subsequently dropped by the author after passage by the Assembly.

Of five proposals to establish the open dating of dairy products and perishable foods, only one measure, by Senator Beilenson, passed its own house. Even so, it died in the Assembly Agriculture Committee. The other four bills did not get out of their initial committees. All would have required food products be stamped with a "pull date" indicating when they should be removed from grocery store shelves in order to insure freshness.

On the other hand, several measures upgrading food standards have been acted upon favorably. Approved by the lower house are Assemblyman Larry Townsend's AB 2832, which prohibits the sale of non-enriched foods when standards for the enriched forms have been established, and requires enriched food products to be labeled in the same manner as dietary foods, and AB 2783 (Briggs) requiring the percentage listing of ingredients in standard bread loaves.

Freshman Assemblyman Peter Chacon's food grading and labeling bills did not muster enough support to overcome industry-wide opposition. Companion drug labeling and advertising bills introduced by Assemblyman Harvey Johnson, calling for mandatory identification of drugs by both their brand and generic names and permitting the advertising of prescription drug prices, were held in the Assembly's Health Committe.

The material content and composition of jewelry sold or appraised by retail outlets and dealers must be disclosed in writing to purchasers under AB 3072 by John Quimby, awaiting Senate approval. The suggested requirement applies to articles of jewelry, including watches, priced at more than $75 and specifies that synthetic and imitation stones must be so identified.

Fees and Charges

The outlook for passage of a funeral industry reform bill this session is surprisingly favorable. Approved by the Senate in August, Beilenson's SB 1268 establishes a mandatory disclosure requirement for services rendered by funeral directors. Mortuary and embalming charges and the prices of caskets must be provided in writing to the customer before any agree-

(Continued on page 214)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

California's Democratic Party: Organization, Leadership and Reform Proposals

BY T. JESSE GOFF

The maneuvering of national figures for influence and support throughout the state ordinarily dominates the affairs of California's political parties in the year before a presidential election. Of more pressing concern to California Democrats in the last eight months, however, has been the rather delicate and often painful, though less visible, issue of internal reform in party organization and strategy. Party reform dominated the Democratic state convention in Sacramento last January when the party elected its new officers and was the sole subject of a special convention called in San Jose in mid-May.

Party Power

Political party power depends a great deal on the creation of an interlocking dependency with government at all levels. In areas of the country where a party has established such a dependency, influence, prestige and jobs in government flow from the state capitol and beyond through county bureaucracy and mayor's offices to the individual or corporate citizen on the basis of party affiliation. More philosophically, the party and its ideal unity of social purpose forcefully presents the needs of its citizen-members in the brokering of power that is the business of government.

The calculated madness of Progressive Republican Governor Hiram Johnson in 1911 was to destroy party organization in California by imposing legislative controls on party structure and influence. Local and county governmental offices were made completely nonpartisan. A civil service bureaucracy was erected to establish merit, and not party influence, as the key to placement and advancement in public employment. A Progressive legislature under Johnson's guidance made a rubble heap of traditional pyramidal party structure, enacting legislation that took from party members the determination of even the most minor internal procedures. And perched precariously atop the heap were the legislators themselves who had dominated the state conventions through appointment powers but whose very jobs now depended ultimately not upon noisy conventions and backroom appointments but upon state-supervised open party primaries.

The reform package endorsed by state Democrats at Sacramento and San Jose this year attempts to remake much of what Progressives undid sixty years ago. Spurred by the spirit of the McGovern Commission on the national level of the party and the disasterous Chicago convention of 1968, California Democrats hope to once again restore the political party as the essential entré into state government and political processes. The actual reform plan, which has survived largely intact, was the work of a commission headed by State Senator George Moscone and Councilman Thomas Bradley of Los Angeles. Political scientist Ed Constantini is the author of the section on party restructuring.

The most far-reaching portions of the commission's program — which will require as-yet-unwritten legislation — recreates a pyramidal political party that is based on the assembly district rather than on the traditional county central committee. The county committee has been retained only to coordinate certain technical formalities with the county registrar's office.

Precinct Delegates

Under the reform proposals, within each assembly district, from five to ten precincts will be grouped together to form precinct areas. An assembly district convention, attended by delegates from the precinct areas, will elect representatives to a statewide party convention.

Delegates to the San Jose convention also approved a proposal to change the Elections Code to allow party identification of candidates in local elections. The Democrats have enjoyed a registration edge (of varying size) over the Republicans since the Depression. An embarrassing Republican monopoly of state government throughout much of the first half of this century was only broken after the Democrats in the 1950's were able to pass legislation requiring candidates for state office to indicate their party membership. Party identification in local elections, proponents feel, would have a similar effect on Democratic representation in city and county government. However, an accompanying proposal to allow party endorsement of candidates in primary elections, local and statewide, was rejected by the party convention.

Reform commission members have peddled the revisions of party structure to their fellow Democrats under a guiding philosophy that promises the new structure will bring the disaffected and the neutral into the Democratic fold. The proposed reorganization, in the words of Northern California chairman Jack Brooks, would establish "a direct line of responsibility and accountability by the election process from the precinct voter to the statewide party." More important to party strategists who are supporting the reform, however, seems to be a hope that a structurally unified and interdependent party will bring the formal political party back into state government and politics where it has been conspicuously absent in the last sixty years.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The future of the reform package, now that it has been sent to the Legislature for consideration, is uncertain in that it is intended to relegate legislators to a less prominent role in drafting the party platform and in electing party officers. Legislators would lose little else in the reorganization, however, as the higher state levels of the party have had little or no power in the past over the local precincts or districts where elections are won or lost. Indeed, legislative political prominence among Democrats in the past has been more firmly based in the ability of leaders such as Jess Unruh, Bob Moretti, George Moscone and Hugh Burns to accumulate critically needed money from willing lobbyists and to funnel it into key legislative races.

Underlying much of the party's reform movement has been a basic desire to bring in new blood and fresh ideas by any means possible. The party's new chairman has already gone quite a distance towards the realization of that goal.

Attorney Charles Manatt assumed formal command of the state Democratic party last January when he won a close victory over former Congressman George Brown for the job of state party chairman. Manatt, 34, is a self-proclaimed "moderate" Democrat. He is a close ally and long time acquaintance of Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti. Manatt engineered John Tunney's successful campaign for the U.S. Senate last year, including Tunney's primary victory over Brown. (See interview with Manatt, *California Journal,* June-July 1971.)

The first step Mannat has taken as chairman is to assure a strong financial base for the central committee staff over which he presides. A unique money-raising arrangement that will guarantee a considerable war chest for next year's elections was hammered out in the spring with party leaders in Washington. Manatt won agreement from those national figures who are obvious candidates for the party's presidential nomination to extend the services of central committee staff and volunteer party organizers in California to Democratic presidential hopefuls for the customary whirlwind tours of benefit dinners and public appearances in the state. In exchange, the candidates agreed that 50 percent of the proceeds will remain with the local party unit sponsoring each event and 50 percent with a special presidential election fund to be administered by the state central committee. This fund will be dispersed in California only after the national party convention in Miami next year, and will be directed towards insuring that the Democratic presidential candidate will win California's critical electoral votes in the general elections next fall. The agreement lasts until January of next year when state party leaders feel it can no longer be enforced.

Prestige Fund Clubs

Manatt has also sought to expand the operational money available to the central committee offices by increasing membership in the State Democratic Finance Committee and other prestige political membership clubs that allow the contributor to rub shoulders with the party's leaders in and out of government. The Finance Committee membership dues of $1000 a year goes directly to fund the central commitee operation in Los Angeles. Jack Brooks in the North, along with the northern treasurer John Merlo, has expanded the San Francisco-based Chairman's Advisory Committee into Sacramento and San Jose. Advisory committee members pay $25 a month. In the South, the Century Club for $100 a month provides the same type of organization. What effect members of such prestige groups have on decision-making in the party is completely up to the supervising regional chairman. The role is usually insignificant, restricted to several informal breakfasts or luncheons each year with visiting polticians.

Staffing Build-up

Manatt has begun beefing up the central committee's professional staff in anticipation of next year's election. In Los Angeles, the staff includes press secretary Bill Gruver, executive secretary Terry Utterback, finance director Ethel Narvid, director of field operations Tom Rice, and office director Kay Triplett. Much of the central committee's business, such as escorting Democratic hopefuls through the southland, is handled by Joe Cerrell Associates, a political campaign and polling firm run by the former executive secretary of the party under past chairman Eugene Wyman in the early sixties.

With the structural reforms of the party caught up in the legislative doldrums, the most important development among California Democrats this year may be their sudden awakening to modern staffing procedures on the level of the state central committee, an emphasis pioneered in the early sixties by the Republican Cal Plan. Democrats have relied heavily on the use of legislative staff in developing statewide election strategies and in staging campaign benefits on the state level. The Republicans, who have used a well-oiled central committee staff to perform this function, have criticized use of Democratic legislative staff on state payroll for the managment of critical legislative battles.

Election Victories

Manatt has also laid the groundwork for an important statewide registration drive among new voters between 18 and 21, and has appreciably smoothed the regional animosity that has in the past soured relations between party chairmen and their regional vice-chairmen.

The final test of management is its productivity. Party leaders under Manatt have accomplished a good deal in the last nine months. Particularly satisfying to them was the party's special election victory in Los Angeles on July 20th. The special election of former Assemblyman Dave Roberti to fill the vacancy in the 27th Senate District to the State Senate was particularly important to Manatt. The seat in the 27th Senate District was vacated by the election of former State Senator George Danielson to Congressman George Brown's 29th Congressional District seat. While southern party workers received substantial support from Sacramento, the campaign was controlled and staffed by the party in the south and represents a victory for Manatt. It is the first Democratic victory in a state legislative special election in nine years, and the win gives the Democrats a close 21 to 19 majority in the State Senate.

Democrats throughout the state have been elated by recent polls that show newly enfranchised young

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voters between 18 and 21 years of age with a marked preference for the Democratic party over any other. Plans are being drawn up by the Democrats, north and south, for a massive registration drive among these young people. The high spirits were further raised when Attorney General Younger's recent opinion that unmarried persons between the ages of 18 and 21 must register and vote in the counties where their parents reside was overturned. Younger's opinion would have diluted much of that vote in and around large university areas where Democrats can muster it to greatest advantage. Several suits were filed to challenge Younger, including one by Common Cause.

Wealthy Leaders

If the Democratic party has been the historical haven of the economically deprived, that image is hardly realized in its three top state officers here in California. Manatt, who has a very lucrative law practice, specializes in corporate and banking law. Jack Brooks, Northern Chairman, is a millionaire real estate developer who enjoys a brisk business in building low-income housing. Southern Chairman Larry Lawrence owns the posh Hotel Del Coronado in San Diego and reportedly has an annual income in the range of $250,000.

Manatt has divided the party into two nearly autonomous regional units under each regional chairman. A gentleman's agreement confines the fund-raising activities and organizational efforts of each man to his own region, with Lawrence working the largely Republican strongholds of San Diego, Orange, Imperial, Riverside and San Bernardino counties, while Brooks handles the vast northern half of the state from San Francisco. Manatt, while retaining general supervision, directs the Los Angeles office of the Central Committee that serves Democrats there and in Santa Barbara and Ventura counties.

Lawrence runs the smallest of the three Central Committee offices with an executive secretary, Joyce O'Connor Hadley and a field representative, Michael Hirschfield. His reputation in the party rests predominantly on his ability to raise money, and he will receive the first test of his political campaigning skill later this year if Republican Assemblyman Pete Wilson wins the race for mayor of San Diego. Wilson's district is more liberal than most in San Diego County and is ripe for Democratic takeover.

Brooks, centered in Democratic San Francisco, has given his staff a far freer rein than his immediate predecessor in that city, former party chairman Roger Boas. The San Francisco central committee office operates with a budget of about $5,000 to $6,000 a month with a staff that includes full-time executive secretary John Atkinson, press secretary Ann Bardwell, office manager Jean Maher and a new field representative Chris Landis. Brooks has organized the party's northern volunteer activities and projects into an interesting "corporate board" of six or seven vice-chairmen. The range of participation extends from former US Attorney Cecil Poole who worked on the party's challenge to Attorney General Younger's registration opinion, to student Jill Fischer, who directs northern youth activities. Brooks will likely be a candidate for party chairman in 1973, when by law the chairmanship of the state party must return to the north.

Manatt has scored an important victory in a legislative election. Party coffers, largely because of the new party chairman's innovations and drive, are in excellent shape for an off-election year. After years of legislative domination of the party, Manatt has quietly and confidently assumed leadership while maintaining close relations with his party's legislative leadership. Whatever becomes of the party's reform package in Sacramento, Manatt has so far shepherded the state's Democrats calmly through a major ideological debate without the suicidal divisiveness that has so often destroyed Democratic strength in California.

POPULATION OF CALIFORNIA STATE SENATE DISTRICTS

Since our last issue went to press, new and more accurate figures have been made available to us. The table below replaces the table published on page 172 in the June-July issue.

District	Senator	Over/Under 498,828 'Ideal'	Percent Over/Under
1	Collier (D)	— 68,182	—13.7
2	Marler (R)	— 73,512	—14.7
3	Teale (D)	— 72,277	—14.5
4	Behr (R)	— 51,489	—10.3
5	Rodda (D)	— 61,450	—12.3
6	Short (D)	— 14,530	— 2.9
7	Nejedly (R)	+ 59,561	+11.9
8 & 11*	Holmdahl (D)	— 56,144	— 5.6
	Petris (D)		
9 & 10*	Marks (R)	—281,982	—28.3
	Moscone (D)		
12	Gregorio (D)	+ 57,406	+11.5
13	Alquist (D)	+112,643	+22.6
14	Bradley (R)	+ 86,088	+17.2
15	Way (R)	—130,530	—26.2
16	Zenovich (D)	— 94,001	—18.8
17	Grunsky (R)	— 1,051	— 0.2
18	Stiern (D)	—105,056	—21.1
19	Richardson (R)	— 500	— 0.1
20	Coombs (R)	+ 76,697	+15.4
21	Harmer (R)	— 669	— 0.1
22	Carrell (D)	— 13,888	— 2.8
23	Cusanovich (R)	+ 84,819	+17.0
24	Lagomarsino (R)	+141,926	+28.5
25	Stevens (R)	+ 20,106	+ 4.0
26	Beilenson (D)	— 65,972	—13.2
27	Roberti (D)	— 57,915	—11.6
28	Song (D)	+ 5,119	+ 1.0
29	Dymally (D)	— 96,566	—19.4
30	Walsh (D)	— 27,343	— 6.1
31	Wedworth (D)	— 38,601	— 7.7
32	Dills (D)	— 1,063	— 0.2
33	Kennick (D)	— 7,844	— 1.6
34	Carpenter (R)	+398,192	+79.8
35	Whetmore (R)	+276,451	+55.4
36	Cologne (R)	+ 68,793	+13.8
37	Deukmejian (R)	+ 1,884	+ 0.4
38	Burgener (R)	+ 69,410	+13.9
39	Schrade (R)	— 76,016	—15.2
40	Mills (D)	— 57,532	—11.5

*At-Large

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State Treasurer Guides State's Banking, Borrowing and Investing

On August 17th the State of California offered for sale $150 million in revenue anticipation notes so it could continue to pay its bills and maintain the services which its citizens expect. Although the state frequently used registered warrants in the 1930's to meet its cash needs, this was the first time California has borrowed against future tax revenues for this purpose.

Authority for this new form of borrowing was obtained by urgency legislation passed quickly in the early part of the legislative session when it became obvious that a new tax program could not be agreed upon in time to resolve the state's growing fiscal crisis. The urgency measure, SB 734 (Grunsky), authorized the state to sell short-term revenue anticipation notes during 1971 in a total amount of up to 15 percent of estimated annual General Fund revenues, or about $648 million.

Thanks to California's strong credit rating in the national money market, these first notes were sold without difficulty to a low-bidding syndicate of major western banks. Nevertheless, the buyers' bid of 2.72 percent will mean a net interest cost to the state of $918,000 when the notes are redeemed November 15th. And this figure will continue to grow as additional notes are sold to cover the revenue gap.

Somewhat ironically, the woman who, as the state's banker, was responsible for selling the notes has taken great pride in the extent to which she has added to state revenues by lending money to others. Less than a year earlier, Mrs. Ivy Baker Priest, California's 25th State Treasurer, had told voters around the state as she campaigned for reelection that she had made over $300 million for the state from the investment of state funds during her first term in office. This investment income, she said, made California "the state with the highest earnings, second only to the federal reserve system."

State's Banker

"I am the state's banker, and this means I must look after the interests of the state of California," says Mrs. Priest in describing her responsibilities as State Treasurer. And, in fact, the term "state's banker" rather accurately describes her office. The principal duties of the State Treasurer, which have changed little over the years, are: (1) to provide custody to all state cash and securities; (2) to administer the investment of state funds which are not required to meet immediate obligations; (3) to prepare, sell, and redeem state bonds; (4) to pay all warrants drawn by the State Controller; and (5) to prevent local districts and other public agencies from issuing unsound securities.

To carry out these duties the Treasurer's Office has a staff of 55 permanent employees. Serving under Mrs. Priest is Alex Steinkamp, Deputy State Treasurer, who supervises the operation of the office and advises Mrs. Priest on the marketing of state bonds. The Assistant Treasurer, Robert Rousek, serves as a liaison between the Treasurer's Office and the banking community and also reviews all legislation which would have an effect on the Treasurer's duties. A third senior position is held by Richard Vander Wegen who, as Assistant Deputy Treasurer, is responsible for investment policies and procedures.

Bank Deposits

The state maintains demand deposit accounts with the nine major private banks with offices in Sacramento. Revenues are deposited to the state's credit either by the receiving agencies or the Treasurer. These same accounts are drawn upon by treasury checks to redeem state warrants issued in payment for the goods and services which the state requires.

To offset whatever costs the private banks incur in handling the state demand deposits, the state has agreed to maintain "compensating balances" — minimum deposit levels below which it will not withdraw its funds — which the banks can employ in making loans and other investments. At present these compensating balances, in total, are set at $11 million to $12 million. The banks which hold these deposits must provide collateral equal to 110 percent of the deposited amount as a safeguard for the public funds.

Pooled Investments

In 1955 the Legislature established a Pooled Money Investment Board to develop and supervise the state's cash management and investment programs. The members of this board are the State Treasurer, the State Controller and the Director of Finance. The Treasurer serves as chairman and makes all day-to-day transactions in accordance with the board's policies.

The pooled funds are divided among two accounts: the Pooled Money Investment Account and the Condemnation Deposits Fund. The Pooled Money Investment Fund is drawn from all deposited state General Fund monies in excess of the compensating balances. It also includes the Surplus Money Investment Fund

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which consists of the cash balances of special funds (e.g., the State Highway Fund and the Teachers' Retirement Fund) which either do not have investment authority of their own or, if they do, have elected to join in this program. The Condemnation Deposits Fund consists of monies deposited by the State Treasurer under court order in eminent domain proceedings.

These funds are invested by the Treasurer as interest-bearing time deposits, notes and bonds of the federal government, state and local bonds, and certain "blue chip" commercial securities. The authority to invest in stocks was granted by the Legislature in 1968 at the Treasurer's urging. The authorization is limited to 15 percent of invested funds and the firms whose securities are purchased must have assets of at least $1.5 billion. Moreover, these stocks may not be held for more than 90 days.

The Treasurer can invest all other funds for periods of from one day up to more than ten years. However, in practice 90 percent of the available funds are invested for terms of 90 days or less. In 1970-71 the average daily investments of the Pooled Money Investment Account totalled $1,236,866,000 and for the Condemnation Deposit Fund totalled $28,027,675. "I handle more money in one hour," says Mrs. Priest, "than most people will make in their lifetimes." Total yearly earnings in fiscal year 1969-70 were $100 million but dropped off in 1970-71 to about $85 million as interest rates declined.

Bond Sales

Over the years, California has come to rely heavily upon bonds to obtain funds for capital construction for public schools, higher education, parks, hospitals, and water resources. As a consequence, the State Treasurer sells more general obligation bonds than any other governmental agency in the nation, other than the federal government. These bonds, which are secured by all the state's revenues, must first be authorized by the Legislature for placement on the ballot and then approved by the voters.

At some point between approval of the bonds by the voters and the time when the proceeds are required for expenditure, the Treasurer must select the most favorable date for their sale to underwriting syndicates. This date depends on such factors as current economic conditions, the trend in long-term interest rates, and the current market supply of state, municipal, federal and corporate bonds.

The Treasurer sells bonds at a minimum denomination of $5,000 to underwriting syndicates who then sell the bonds to the public. The winning bid at the bond auctions is always the lowest interest rate charged. In 1970-71, $717.9 million in bonds were sold with interest rates ranging from 4.3 percent to 5.5 percent. At a recent major state bond sale in June, $100 million worth of Clean Water, Veterans', and Recreation bonds sold at an average interest rate of 5.36 percent.

Currently, the Treasurer has more than one billion dollars in authorized but unissued bonds awaiting program needs and favorable marketing conditions. This backlog is a result not only of the 1970 freeze on bond sales, which occurred when interest rates exceeded the constitutional ceiling, but also of Governor Reagan's use of bond financing for most major capital outlay projects. Normally, the State Treasurer sells between $500 and $600 million in bonds each year, but, according to Robert Rousek, Assistant Treasurer, "one and a half billion dollars could be approved and sold without hurting the state's credit rating."

When the Legislature recessed in August it had already approved $350 million in school construction bonds and $294 million for UC health science facilities, and was still considering $185 million in community college construction bonds, $250 million in bonds for veterans' farm and home loans, $300 million for urban recreation facilities, and $250 million for state beaches and parks. Arguing that too many additional bonds will not only jeopardize the sale of those previously approved but will also further increase the annual interest cost to the state (now over $180 million), the Reagan administration is generally cool to these pending measures. The administration is presently neutral with respect to the community college and UC bonds but opposed to the urban recreation and park system bonds.

Trust Duties

Another function of the Treasurer's Office is the safekeeping of state-owned securities, tax and insurance pledges of private firms, and the collateral pledged by banks and insurance companies with state accounts. The Treasurer currently holds approximately $7 billion in such securities and other assets, with most of this amount in the Treasurer's vault in the capitol. Several years ago in a move to publicize this trust function, Mrs. Priest had a thick glass window installed in one wall of the vault so that tourists passing along the first floor hallway may get a look inside.

In 1931, following default by many local special districts in the payment of interest on their outstanding bonds, the Legislature set up a five-member District Securities Commission to supervise the banking activities of such districts. In 1969 this San Francisco-based unit became a division of the Treasurer's Office with its members appointed by the Treasurer. The executive secretary of the commission, T. P. Stiver, has a nine-man staff assigned to examining the debt proposals of special districts and approving their financial programs.

Lone Woman

Mrs. Priest, who has long been active in the Republican party, won responsibility for overseeing these activities through election in 1966 and reelection in 1970. She takes evident pride in her post. As one of the few women in prominent state positions, she is aware of the advantages as well as the disadvantages, but expresses the hope that she will be judged on her "ability to do the job" rather than on any other basis.

Having served as Treasurer of the United States in the Eisenhower administration, Mrs. Priest has been active in many public functions and has received a number of honors ranging from nomination as one of the 20 most outstanding women of the century to having her name given to a mountain in Alaska. In all probability, Mrs. Priest has a secure hold on her office for as long as she wishes to continue in it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Obscure State Land Management Agency Draws Renewed Public Attention

Four million acres of California land, most of it along the 3-mile belt of tide and submerged lands of the Pacific Coast, are in the custody of a little known state agency with the title of State Lands Commission.

The commission consists of three *ex officio* members: the Lt. Governor, the Controller and the Director of Finance. It employs a staff of 168 full-time employees in what is called the State Lands Division, which has its headquarters in Los Angeles and is not a division of anything but a largely autonomous agency which is seldom listed on state organizational charts.

It is also an agency which has come to be an important revenue producer — it it expected to obtain $38.8 million in income from oil, gas and other leasing operations in 1971-72 — and this embarrassment of riches and a growing public concern about state land use and resource protection have thrust the commission back into the spotlight. The result has been a series of challenges to the commission's actions and policies. In its recently released report, *Power and Land in California*, Ralph Nader's Task Force on California land use called for an end to both the commission and the division. Less severe critics have objected strongly to commission approval of offshore oil-drilling following the Santa Barbara disaster, its role in the establishment of the City of Long Beach's Maritime Museum (the Queen Mary project), its approval of the development of Upper Newport Bay, and its actions on similar projects which have come before it for approval. Recently a Legislative Committee harshly criticized representatives of the division for not knowing whether a large and valuable finding of jade off the Santa Cruz coast had been mined from state land.

Early Holdings

The largely unmapped domain which the State of California has accumulated began coming into state hands when, upon admission to statehood in September of 1850, the state succeeded to sovereign ownership of 2.5 million acres of offshore tidelands and submerged lands. In that some month the federal government granted California title to all the swamp and overflowed lands within its borders. Three years later, Congress made additional major grants to California, most significantly the school land grants which gave the state title to the 16th and 36th sections within each township in the state. Thus, within a few years of its entrance into the Union, California acquired ownership of approximately 11.5 million acres of land.

All state holdings of land were the responsibility of a constitutional officer known as the Surveyor General, and those who held the office saw to it that the state began unburdening itself of these holdings. At a pace which nearly rivaled that under which the state first acquired ownership, almost all of the swamp and overflowed lands (approximately 2.5 million acres) and most of the school lands (4.75 million of the original 5.2 million acres) passed from the state to other ownership. The practice of generously dispensing state lands to private owners resulted in the land scandals which began in the 1850's and finally led to an amendment to the state's constitution to prohibit further transfer of state land to private ownership.

There followed a period of relative calm in the administration of state lands which lasted until 1928. In that year the responsibility was shifted from the Surveyor General to a single officer in the newly-created Department of Finance. Soon afterward it was discovered that Governor Frank Merriam's appointee to this position had signed a series of leases covering the area of the Wilmington oil field, then a subject of litigation contesting the state's claim to the land. The announcement of what became a billion dollar oil scandal rocked the Merriam administration and launched reform action which led to the present state lands management structure.

In 1938, the Legislature created the three-member State Lands Commission which was intended to be independent of the direct influence of the Governor. The important fact, however, was that two fiscal officers of the state, the Controller and the Director of Finance, were given a majority vote, reflecting the strong interest at the time in realizing the maximum financial return from state-owned land. And there are other ways in which the 1938 law reflects the understandable judgment of the time that increased revenue was the paramount interest. For example, any grant of tidelands by the Legislature to a city or county is conditioned by the requirement that the agency '"make improvements" within 10 years. In 1938, any use of a natural resource which failed to produce a profit was regarded as a failure. And that attitude continues to animate the commission three decades later.

Today, however, new perspectives on the way profit is derived from resource uses, as well as increasing consideration for the myriad of environmental factors in land use policy, are pointing toward a reexamination of the State Land Commission's traditional role and objectives.

State Lands Programs

The present programs of the State Lands Commission are designed to achieve three objectives, according to a 1969 Commission Report:

- To establish the uses of those state lands which have not been granted by the Legislature to local government units.
- To locate the boundaries of sovereign lands owned by the state (tide and submerged lands).
- To maintain records showing location of state-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

owned lands (tide and submerged lands as well as "school" lands) and encumbrances thereon.

Despite the report's acknowledgement of the "increasingly central role that the sovereign lands are playing in the State's response . . . to those factors which are now seen to add to the quality and appreciation of life," the heavy emphasis of the commission's program is on producing revenue from extractive development.

The agency is currently developing policies and procedures, pursuant to the Geothermal Resources Act of 1967, to begin an "aggressive but prudent" geothermal steam development program. Presently, there are approximately 6,000 acres of state land under development permits in the Geysers area of Sonoma County and 535 acres in the Salton Sea in Imperial County. Pending are permit applications for an additional 25,000 acres at Mono Lake, Mono County, and at the Geysers. Division officials believe there are over 100,000 acres of state land with potential geothermal royalty earnings for the state.

Oil Revenues

The 225,000 barrels a day of oil production from the Long Beach tidelands development still provides most of the state revenue from division activities and most of the problems for the division. One of these problems stems from the fact that the City of Long Beach shares equally with the state in all advance royalties paid by the East Wilmington field contractor.

In 1911 the Legislature gave the Cities of San Diego, Los Angeles, Oakland and Long Beach a grant in trust to all tidelands and submerged lands within their boundaries with the intention of encouraging development of their harbors. This action posed no particular problem until 1937 when rich oil deposits were discovered in the Long Beach lands. In a test case, *City of Long Beach v. Marshall,* Long Beach obtained a court ruling that the city had acquired the mineral rights along with the land, inasmuch as the state did not reserve the mineral rights when it made the grant.

The income from oil royalties soon exceeded the city's need for expenditures on authorized "trust projects", however, and Long Beach sought to extend use of this revenue to general city needs. It was blocked from doing so by a decision that the city was authorized to spend tideland revenue only on harbor projects. As a consequence, the city began to accumulate a large surplus of oil revenues. In 1951 the Legislature freed 50 percent of the accumulated income, and the courts subsequently ruled this would revert to the state. Faced with the loss of revenue, Long Beach agreed to a compromise, and in 1956 the Legislature passed a law giving the state 50 percent of the Long Beach revenues and specifying that the city could spend its share of the tidelands revenue on authorized projects only with the approval of the State Lands Commission, an opinion from the Attorney General, or by a court decree.

Queen Mary Project

In 1961 the State Lands Commission gave initial approval to a maritime museum project proposed by the city and released $500,000 of the requested $5 million. Three years later the Legislature specifically authorized a "Maritime Museum and related facilities" and modified the authority of the commission so it could review the propriety, but not the extent, of the expenditures on the museum.

In 1967 the Queen Mary was acquired by the city with tidelands revenue to be used as a maritime museum with various concession features added. Originally, the museum was to cost $9 million, and it was anticipated that private contributions would add an additional $2 million. In fact, the ship alone delivered to Long Beach cost $5,367,240. The Auditor General, in reviewing the project in May, 1969, reported that the total cost was estimated to run as high as $32 million, exceeding original estimates threefold.

The increased expenditure has prompted questions about whether the 1964 law limiting the use of the funds is being violated. The commission argues that its authority to review expenditures is restricted to reviewing expenditures in terms of conformity with the law, and the commission has been reluctant to attempt, by administrative action, to broaden the scope of its authority as suggested by critics.

Reorganization Proposed

Currently, two proposed reorganizations of the Lands Division are before the Legislature. Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti has a proposal, AB 1526, which would give the commission statutory power to halt any drilling which is operating in an ultrahazardous manner, confined to drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel. Additionally, the bill would add two public members to the State Lands Commission and require public hearings in determinations of whether a well is being operated in an ultrahazardous manner. The commission opposes the bill because it says it already has and exercises the authority to prevent ultrahazardous drilling. Further, it sees no need for additional public members because it believes the public is already represented by the commission.

Two measures authored by Senator Alfred E. Alquist would dramatically alter the commission's role. The name would be changed to the Commission on California Lands, and it would be given authority to adopt general zoning regulations applicable to public and private lands throughout the state. The bills, killed in Senate committee this year for the second time, would have also mandated the commission to administer state-owned lands, giving primary consideration to environmental quality. Two public members would have been added to the commission.

The prospect of state land use zoning, even on the basis of such broad use categories outlined in the Alquist bills, is anathema to land developers, some property owners, and many local governmental jurisdictions. Even the provision of the bill requiring that the commission give full consideration to environmental factors in the lease, sale and management of the state's lands has not been warmly received, despite the fact that the commission frequently complains that its hands are tied in giving consideration to such factors.

It appears likely that an effort will be made to reassess state policy governing management of its lands, giving more recognition to resource protection. It is doubtful, however, that growing public concern over land use practices in California will result soon in any substantial restructuring of the State Lands Commission, mainly because the agency itself (and the Reagan administration) is unreceptive to an expanded role.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Student Interns Infiltrate Sacramento

Jack Clossen, a senior at UC Santa Barbara, spent much of the past summer helping to prepare a study of campaign spending for the Secretary of State. Robin Stickney, a senior at Stanford, worked in Senator Dennis Carpenter's office researching small claims court reform. UCLA student Allan Hacker participated in an investigation of the mercury content of the air conducted by the Department of Air Resources.

Interesting work, for the most part, but more than that — a chance for each student to participate directly in the real tasks of state government, to learn something of the whole by becoming a small part. And for the agencies, a chance to put fresh young minds to work on some hard old problems at very little cost to the taxpayers.

Clossen, Stickney and Hacker were only three of some 250 student interns who came to Sacramento during the past year to work at state government for a term, the summer, or a full year. They worked for individual legislators, they worked in major state departments, and they worked in the offices of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and Secretary of State. Undergraduates and graduate students, they came from Sacramento State, Fresno State, UC Davis, UC Santa Barbara, UCLA, Stanford, and McGeorge School of Law.

Summer Interns

The greatest number of students came to Sacramento as summer interns under programs sponsored by UCLA, UC Santa Barbara and Stanford. The largest of these summer programs, sponsored by the UCLA Associated Students, sent 45 interns to the capital this year, with 24 students assigned to the Legislature and 21 to state administrative agencies. Each student received at least $150 for the summer, and most were expected to cover their additional expenses themselves. For those who couldn't, there were a limited number of scholarships to increase their total income to $450 for the summer.

The UC Santa Barbara program, titled "Gauchos in Government", is restricted to eight to ten student interns. This is done so that the small budget can be stretched to give each intern $250 in pay for the summer and so that individual attention can be offered in matching each student's interests with available jobs in Sacramento. This year there were eight students in the program, most of whom were majoring in political science and had some knowledge of state government.

The Stanford program, the first of its kind when it began in 1967, has stayed the smallest, providing only six internships this summer. The program is supported from a $10,000 endowment fund and is run through the Stanford Alumni Advisory Board. Each student must find his own job and support himself on a $200 stipend without the benefit of student housing available to other intern programs.

There are also several summer intern programs sponsored by the state executive offices. The largest of these has been set up by the Lieutenant Governor's office and this year provided 22 positions each with a salary of $400 for the summer. Students were placed as staff assistants in the various units within the Lieutenant Governor's office and the boards and agencies which are his special concern. This summer, for example, Dave Ernst, a law student at UC Davis, worked with the Lieutenant Governor's staff to develop alternatives to student housing on the state college and University campuses. Jack Ford, working for a task force on narcotics, helped to prepare a brochure for servicemen on drugs, and Nick Chiulos, assigned to the State Clearinghouse, helped to coordinate state applications for federal grants.

The avowed purpose of Lieutenant Governor Reinecke's program is to "get youth involved in government." "These interns came up with darned good ideas," Reinecke said recently. "They drafted most of the resolutions I took to the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors in Sun Valley." The Lieutenant Governor now hopes to find private support to expand this internship program to offer 15 to 20 part-time positions which continue for two academic quarters.

The program may also produce some benefits for other student internship programs. David Jinkins, a graduate in public administration at UCLA, was given the job of rewriting a report on internship programs throughout the state, bringing up to date a survey conducted initially by the California Education and Training and Advisory Council, but never published. In revising the survey, Jinkins is adding a guidebook for administering internship programs to be distributed to counties, cities and universities to aid them in establishing cooperative internship programs.

Legislative Aides

There is also a summer internship run by the Assembly Rules Committee which provides student interns to four Democrats and four Republicans in the Assembly. There is little publicity about this program, however, and students usually find out about the internships through friends in the Legislature. These Assembly summer interns receive $1,000 for the summer and the majority are assigned to do partisan work for the Assembly party leaders and staff.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In addition to the formal programs, many students obtain intern assignments on their own. This session there were over 70 interns working in 40 different Assembly offices and 17 interns working in the Senate. Most of the summer interns who work for legislators find that their jobs entail running simple errands, writing constituent letters and press releases, and preparing bill analyses. A few interns, however, are given special research projects or are able to direct their own activities. This summer, for example, Danny Mar, a UCLA intern, did a study on health care services for Senator Dennis Carpenter's office, and Bob Horacek, in Assemblyman John Burton's office, prepared a migrant labor report which may become a source for legislation next session.

Although their duties were often mundane, many of this summer's legislative interns nevertheless found the experience enjoyable and rewarding. While they understood that their jobs might not be vital to the office in which they worked, they saw in most cases that it gave them an unusual opportunity to study the legislative system. UCLA student Margaret Woodbridge expressed a common reaction when she said, "The system makes more sense now, and the importance of compromise and bargaining are clearer."

Academic Credit

Some campus officials have come to believe that longer-term internships which give the student more time to adjust to the job are more valuable for students. As a consequence, several campuses have set up undergraduate and graduate programs in Sacramento which last from two to six months and enable students to gain academic credit as well as experience. The UC Riverside Political Science Department, for example, gives students 15 units of credit for working full-time in the capitol for one academic quarter. The University of California at Davis sponsors a program which gives interns eight credit units for part-time work during two consecutive academic quarters. The Davis program, coordinated by Dr. Richard Gable, places students in both paying and non-paying jobs in the Legislature, various state agencies and private organizations closely related to state government. Sacramento State College also supports an internship program which is similar to the UCD program.

Assembly Internship Program

Although most Sacramento internships are only temporary, part-time positions, there are three formal, year-long internship programs which allow college graduates to serve in active staff positions with the Legislature. Among these, the Assembly Internship Program is the oldest and probably the most well-known because of the successful placement of its graduates. James Driscoll, who graduated with the first "class" in 1958, is now the Chief Clerk of the Assembly. Interns from later classes have stayed to become Chief Administrative Officer, Assistant to the Speaker, committee consultants, administrative assistants and researchers.

The program is financed by the Assembly, and is intended not only to provide students in the fields of government, journalism, teaching, and law with experience in state government, but also to serve as a training program for legislative staff. Applicants for the program are screened by an executive committee consisting of representatives of participating California universities and colleges and the Assembly Rules Committee. The Assembly interns serve for ten months and were paid $600 a month this year.

Opon arriving in Sacramento in September, each Assembly intern is assigned to a standing committee as a regular staff member and is expected to perform such services as bill analysis, the preparation of press releases, speech drafting, setting up hearings, and researching specific subjects. The fourteenth class (1970-71) is in no way an exception: Dave Ackerman helped analyze the budget for the minority on the Ways and Means Committee and has now been hired as their consultant; Chuck Cole served as staff for the majority on the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Affairs and has recently been hired by the Assembly as an assistant consultant to the Water Committee.

Senate Interns

The Senate also has a year-long internship program which draws from graduate students in political science at the University of California at Davis. This past year the American Political Science Association and the Senate supported one full-time intern, Mary Bourdette, who worked as a consultant for the Senate Committee on Education, and one part-time intern, Bob Foster, who worked as assistant consultant for the Committee on Public Utilities and Corporations.

The other full-time internship program in the Legislature is sponsored by the Urban Affairs Institute and supported by the Ford Foundation. This program is aimed specifically at recruiting minorities into state government and public administration. This year, there were two interns in the Legislature: Clarence Williams, who served as an assistant consultant for the majority on the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, and Andy Tobar, who worked in Senator Zenovich's office.

Governor's Office

Governor Reagan also has two student interns in his office. The two, Rex Hime and Tim Comstock, are both law students at UC Davis, and have worked all year as student advisors to the Governor. Hime initiated the Governor's "random sample meetings" with students from nearby campuses as a means of developing greater rapport between the Govenor and students, and has also done research for some of the Governor's education speeches. Comstock has worked on legislative matters, analyzing bills pertaining to youth and education.

Some Criticism

Despite their attractiveness to many students and their obvious advantages for legislators and state executives, student internships are not without their problems. Some state agencies which might provide excellent internship opportunities refuse to do so for fear that their own staff will become overburdened trying to give the interns adequate supervision. Moreover, the recent state staff freeze has precluded the hiring of interns by agencies which no longer have salary funds to use for this purpose.

Legislators and legislative staff members have also criticized the internship programs for selecting as interns students who lack any rudimentary understand-

(Continued on next page)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing of state government. With most legislative offices already cramped for space, there is little room for student interns who cannot make a real contribution to the work of the office.

But the principal complaint about the summer internship programs in the Legislature is that they bring interns to Sacramento at the height of the session when the regular staff is far too busy to give them adequate supervision and training. The summer interns themselves occasionally complain that they are placed in legislative offices where they are given no useful work and treated as outsiders and denied personal contact with their legislators.

Campus coordinators for the summer programs complain that they cannot get enough funds to enable both rich and poor students to participate. According to Sue Powell, coordinator for the UC Santa Barbara program, "The present programs are prejudiced against minorities and poor white students because they tend to be limited to students who can afford a summer without earning money." Several legislators have also raised the point that minority students are not adequately represented because of the lack of necessary financial support. This session the Assembly has passed and sent to the Senate AB 2180 (Chacon) which would require the state internships to include a percentage of minority students proportional to the enrollment of minority students in California's academic institutions.

Single Program

Last year the Legislature sought to strengthen the administration of the state internship programs by creating a single Public Service Internship Program under the direction of the State Scholarship and Loan Commission. Although the Governor signed the bill, SB 385 (Burgener), to accomplish this, he has so far not agreed to provide the necessary funds to carry out the legislation.

But despite these and other problems the internships are becoming increasingly popular with students and state officials alike. The idea of bringing students into close contact with state government has support from many legislators, who are also aware that qualified and properly supervised interns can do much of the work of regular staff members, relieving them of some of their heavy workload.

Assemblywoman March Fong, an ardent supporter of the student internships, believes that the existing legislative programs should be greatly expanded. "Today," she says, "with so many students graduating in liberal arts, it is necessary to provide them with some job experience before they seek permanent employment. Therefore, I would like to see legislation which would furnish each legislator with at least one student intern and appropriate increased funding for state agencies hiring students. By increasing student participation in state government, it could only help both state government and the students."

The internship programs in the various state agencies are also becoming more popular as the agencies learn to use student interns in conjunction with their permanent staff to provide fresh approaches to the solution of old problems. "Students can provide new ideas and a different outlook," says Jack Held, assistant coordinator of the Lieutenant Governor's Executive Internship Program. "We think the interns can make government more exciting."

Recently the State Personnel Board hired Bob McConnell, a McGeorge law student, to find ways to increase the number of student interns in state agencies and to coordinate administrative internship programs in which 30 state agencies now participate. McConnell believes that the use of students by state agencies will gradually increase as the agencies realize the real value of student internships as sources for staff recruitment, as a way of cutting training costs, and as a means of gaining new insights into governmental operations.

For students, an internship means practical on-the-job experience which may lead to new skills and insights and perhaps a career. More important, the internship experience rounds off the student's education by integrating theory and practice.

Educators are also beginning to see internships as sources of practical experience which can be an important part of a college education for their students. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recently emphasized this point, saying, "Experience outside the classroom can actually benefit classroom performance, making it more meaningful." And for the state colleges and University the internship programs provide a means of enriching their curricula without adding proportionately to their costs.

CONSUMERS *(Continued from page 204)*

ment is completed. In addition, prices must be displayed conspicuously on caskets up for sale.

Employment agency fees, constantly under attack from consumer interests, are to be further regulated under SB 28 (Song). The bill sets maximum rate and fee schedules for temporary employment and terminated employment, and strengthens refunding requirements. Awaiting action in the Assembly, Song's measure also prohibits the use of fictitious names by agency counselors for advertising purposes.

Warranties and Advertising

Extension of the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act to mobile homes and auto and appliance parts has been approved by the Senate. The bill, SB 742 (Song), also adds household goods and personal care items when sold with a warranty to the 1970 consumer warranty law. Other legislation, by Assemblyman Waxman, imposing 30-day warranty coverage on repair services and improvements made to consumer goods, including home improvements, failed to win passage by the Assembly's Judiciary Committee.

A demand for additional advertising controls has produced several measures aimed at insuring the accurate pricing and representation of products. Two Assembly-passed bills carried by Leon Ralph, AB 2639-2640, prohibit the use of the term "free" unless all conditions under which the free gift is offered are spelled out in the advertisement. Ads would be required to show the price of an item in cents, if over $1.00, using figures at least one-half the same size as the dollar figure, unless the price is in whole dollars.

Senator Arlen Gregario's AB 1584 to extend the ban on using a free gift or prize gimmick in an attempt to sell goods or services awaits approval by the Assembly. A person offering a gift or prize as a come-on for making a sales pitch at the customer's home at the time the gift is delivered, must inform the customer of his intended sales presentation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Assemblyman Lewis's AB 2554, which is now in the Senate, may be the instrument for ironing out the conflict, if any, between the umbrella legislation and the new welfare reform law. Lewis and Senator Anthony Beilenson, author of the welfare reform bill, are expected to amend AB 2554 to insure that the two are compatible.

A second potential problem arises from the possible cost to the counties. Despite the increase in state aid, many county welfare departments fear it will be very costly to bring existing programs up to federal standards and to expand their services to those who are not now welfare recipients. To offset some of this cost, the new legislation (like that passed last year) authorizes fees based upon the parents' ability to pay, up to the level of fees now charged by children's centers.

Opposition and Support

Senator H. L. Richardson, an adamant opponent of child care, says that in addition to the burden on taxpayers, child care by the state "denies the parents their prerogative and their responsibility." Not so, says Anne Renner, President of the Sacramento Area Chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW). "Child care is an essential ingredient to bring full equality of opportunity to women in employment and education," she says. Another outspoken champion of child care, Emma Gunterman, editor of the legislative newsletter *On the Capitol Doorstep*, argues that "child care should be a right of everyone, including the working poor, and no one should have to go through welfare to get it."

It is not the custodial aspect which excites many of the proponents, however. They are more interested in what child care can mean in terms of better-educated, better-motivated and less-traumatized children. This element was clearly evident in President Nixon's statement as he approved the federal Interagency Day Care Requirements: "This administration is committed to a new emphasis on child development in the first five years of life," he said. "Preschool centers should be devoted to the development of vigorous young minds and bodies."

Needs of Children

Evaluation studies of preschool educational programs are reported to reveal that children who participate in such programs do significantly better in later school years than those who do not, if their subsequent schooling is not neglected. Educators like Edmund Gordon of Columbia Teachers College believe that the level of intellectual functioning is well developed by three or four years of age. The child who starts life in a poor environment, they say, enters school with a built-in disadvantage which will hold him back regardless of his real abilities.

California's Superintendent of Public Instruction Wilson Riles agrees with this. He foresees a doubling or tripling of learning if a child's potential for learning is developed at an early age. In the case of disadvantaged families, he believes it is "imperative" that there be child care facilities. "I would see child care starting learning experiences as young as two, and the person in charge of a child care center should know something about child growth and development," says Riles. "I think the quality of child care is important, and we can make a great difference in the lives of our population if we give more attention to it."

The Middle-Income Problem

Riles also believes child care should be extended to middle-income families who have been excluded from most state and federal programs. Learning centers located in shopping plazas or office buildings near where mothers live, work or shop, could be provided for parents who now find private facilities unavailable, too expensive, or inadequate in educational programs.

The creation of such centers, if it occurs, is likely to fall to private industry and community organizations. There are some encouraging signs: nationwide franchise organizations such as Kiddie Care and Learning Tree are now extending their operations into middle-class neighborhoods, and franchise nursery schools are offered by Romper Room and Kinder-Care. Unions and large corporations are beginning to experiment with the provision of child care to employees. College and university campuses have also become important centers of development in child care services. (See "Students Push for Campus Child Care Centers", *California Journal*, February 1971).

Legislative Action

Although ambitious proposals were placed before the California Legislature this year, bills involving outlays of money have made little progress. Only one special money bill for child care is still alive: AB 1565 (Sieroty) which calls for $5 million for construction of 100 additional Children's Centers, is in the Senate Finance Committee, but should it clear the Senate, it is likely to be vetoed by the Governor. Thus the child care provisions of the welfare reform act are likely to remain the single major action in this area this year.

The federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare estimates that it costs $1,600 for year-round full-day care of one child. This would mean an expenditure of $160 million for full care for 100,000 children, or about twice as much as is estimated to be spent now for child care in California. If there are as many as 500,000 children who need such care for educational reasons as well as to enable their mothers to work, it is clear that the total of $18 million to be provided by way of the welfare reform law represents only a small advance.

Assemblyman Lewis argues that there will never be enough "public money" to do the job, that private participation on a large scale will be required to meet the total demand. Yet, it is evident that California has moved into a position of leadership in this area and that there are many who intend that this shall be only a beginning.

CHANGES IN SENATE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Recent changes in Senate committee assignments are as follows:

Senator Beilenson resigned from the Judiciary Committee and was appointed by the Rules Committee to the Agriculture Committee;

Senator Petris resigned from the Committee on Health and Welfare;

Newly elected Senator Roberti was appointed to the Committees on Water Resources, Transportation, Judiciary, and Health and Welfare by the Rules Committee.

Senator Richardson replaced Senator Harmer as Vice-chairman of the Education Committee.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

California Journal/*NEWSBRIEFS*

State Supreme Court Rules School Finance Unconstitutional

In a 6-1 ruling made public on August 30th, California's Supreme Court declared that the state's school finance structure is unconstitutional because of its heavy dependence upon local property taxes. This dependence, said the court, means that children in low wealth school districts are denied educational equality while children in wealthy districts benefit unfairly.

The ruling, which is certain to have a major impact on school finance deliberations this year and next, appears to support the contention of many of the state's school finance experts that the state must either adopt a statewide propery tax or substitute state revenues for local revenues in much greater proportion.

Another Creditor Collection Device Held Unconstitutional By Supreme Court

The state's credit industry lost another round when the State Supreme Court this month declared unconstitutional a 99-year-old statute which permitted creditor confiscation without formal hearing. In striking down the law, the Court said it was doing no more than following a 1969 U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Sniadith v. Family Finance Corporation,* the ruling it relied on earlier this year to void statutes which allowed creditors to attach the wages of debtors and to enter a debtor's home to reclaim merchandise. The Court ruled that the attachment practice puts debtors under severe pressure to settle claims, whether or not the claims are valid. The case was brought before the Court by Joseph Randone of Sacramento and the Sacramento Legal Aid Society.

Ethics Committee Dismisses Land Deal Charges

In an unprecedented public hearing, the Joint Legislative Ethics Committee dismissed charges of a land deal "arrangement" among Assemblyman L. E. Townsend, Assemblywoman Pauline Davis and a northern California rancher. The issue arose when the *Sacramento Bee* reported that Townsend and Davis bought land parcels in Plumas County from landowner Roy Carmichael at less than one-quarter their market value. According to the *Bee,* Carmichael said that in 1966 he sold 10 acres of land to Davis at a reduced rate because he "wanted to show (his) appreciation for what she has done for California agriculture and the cattlemen in the Legislature." The paper said Davis introduced Carmichael to Townsend in 1970, and Townsend then bought a four-acre parcel from the Portola landowner.

Ethics Committee Chairman Robert S. Stevens, after reviewing the report of investigator Robert K. Puglia, announced on August 10 that his six-member committee could find no evidence that Davis or Townsend had made an "arrangement" to do something for Carmichael in return for the low land price he offered them. This was the first public hearing by lawmakers into the activities of their fellow legislators since the Ethics Committee was created in 1967. Following the announcement of the decision, Mrs. Davis indicated she intended to file suit against the *Bee.*

Welfare Caseloads Decline With Slight Employment Gain

The California Department of Social Welfare announced in mid-August that state welfare caseloads and payments, as reported for July, continued a downward movement which started in April. Preliminary figures indicated a decline of 12,000 in the total caseload and nearly $1 million in total payments. Social Welfare Director Robert B. Carleson expressed the administration's pleasure in the continuing downward trend and credited most of the decrease to administrative changes adopted by his agency.

The detailed figures show that most of the caseload reduction has occurred in Aid to Families with Dependent Children for families with an unemployed father. In July, for example, the number of recipients in this category declined by 20,782 while the remaining AFDC caseload grew by over 6,000 recipients. Thus it appears that a central factor in the current trend may also be the slow decline in the state's unemployment rate, which has moved from a high of 7.4 percent in April to 7.0 percent in July.

Wakefield Announces Initiative For Reduced Legislator Salaries

Neither legislators nor the Governor should be exempt from the state's fiscal squeeze, according to Assemblyman Floyd Wakefield. The conservative Republican lawmaker has announced a voters' initiative campaign to reduce by 25 percent a recent salary increase which legislators voted themselves and the Governor. Prior to a 1966 constitutional amendment, legislative pay raises had to be ratified by the voters. The amendment removed the requirement for voter approval, raised legislators' yearly salaries from $6,000 to $16,000 and permitted a five percent yearly cost-of-living increase. Legislators did not opt for the provisional increase until 1969 when they granted themselves a 20 percent salary boost to $19,200 effective in 1971. The Governor was also given a raise effective 1971, increasing his annual salary by $5,100 to $49,100.

Earlier this year, Wakefield introduced legislation to reduce the legislative raises, but the measure was killed by the Assembly Employment and Public Employees Committee, with only three of the 10 committee members present. Wakefield hopes to reverse his legislative defeat with the initiative, which requires 520,806 registered voters to put it on the ballot. "The issue now rests in the hands of the people," he said. "The results of this campaign will be the responsibility of those who believe in fiscal responsibility in government."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Highway Policy Announced To Help Protect Coastline

California's 840-mile coastline will be protected against unnecessary further intrusion by the state highway system under a new coastal highway planning policy adopted by the State Department of Public Works, and strongly supported by Governor Reagan. The new plan encourages the use of inland highways for interstate travel, with exceptions to be made only in areas where the coastal highway is the only available route for business or recreational travel. If a need develops for transportation systems in the coastal zone, priority will be given to inland routes and to alternate means of transportation, such as buses or rapid transit. The Public Works policy is designed to conserve the limited natural resources of California's coastline and, according to Governor Reagan, is intended to "emphasize safe business and recreational driver enjoyment of the coast rather than the speed of vehicular movement."

States Urged to Pay Legal Costs for Poor

The President's Advisory Commission on Intragovernmental Relations released a report on August 25th recommending that the states, rather than local government, assume all costs of providing legal defense for poor persons in criminal cases. The commission reported that in a nationwide survey of compliance with Supreme Court decisions which require the states to provide defense counsel for the poor, it found a "patchwork response" which meets neither the letter nor the spirit of the decisions. Better compliance can be obtained, according to the commission, if the states pick up the full costs instead of relying upon local agencies. In California the state pays only 10 per cent of the amount expended by counties to provide legal assistance to indigents charged with the violation of state laws.

In related recommendations, the commission called on the states to assume the costs of financing all local courts, to reduce the role of grand juries in criminal cases, and to establish more effective machinery for removing unfit judges.

Assembly Passes Measure to Expand Eighteen-Year-Olds' Responsibilities

Eighteen-year-olds now have the vote, but two measures to set eighteen as the age of majority for other rights and responsibilities of adulthood have been approved by the Assembly. A bill by Assemblyman Paul Priolo, AB 2887, lowers the age of majority from 21 to 18 in all matters except the consumption or purchase of alcoholic beverages. Among the rights extended to 18-year-olds under Priolo's bill would be the right to enter into contracts, to sue or be sued, to serve on a jury, and to become a lawyer, dentist, doctor or peace officer (professions now reserved for people over 21). Filling in the gap in Priolo's bill is a constitutional amendment introduced by Assemblyman Robert C. Cline, which allows 18-year-olds to legally buy and drink alcoholic beverages. Both measures await action by the Senate following the legislative recess.

Assembly Approves Creation of State Pollution Control Agency

Legislation to abolish such existing state agencies as the Water Resources Control Board and the Air Resources Board and replace them with a larger agency with consolidated responsibility for all of California's pollution control efforts has passed the Assembly. The measure, authored by Assemblyman Edwin L. Z'berg, is strongly supported by conservationists. It creates a seven-member State Environmental Quality Board, augmented on the local level by eight regional boards of five members each. The state board has veto power over any state or local project which would endanger the environment, but local governments can approve environmental controls which are more stringent than state laws. Responsibility for the state's pollution control efforts is now dispersed among nearly 120 separate agencies. A statewide ecological master plan, to be completed by 1975, is also required by Z'berg's legislation, which calls for the development of regional plans by 1976.

The bill is expected to face stiff opposition in the Senate Government Organization Committee. A counter measure proposed by Governor Reagan (see June-July NEWSBRIEFS) which will consolidate all pollution control agencies into a Department on Environmental Protection is also pending.

Supreme Court Permits 18-Year-Olds To Vote Where They Live

The State Supreme Court's decision that persons between the ages of 18 and 21 can vote where they live — even if their parents reside elsewhere — is expected to give new young voters significant political leverage in student communities such as Berkeley and Isla Vista. The ruling of the Court reverses an opinion issued earlier this year by Attorney General Evelle J. Younger which held that unmarried minors must register at their parents' address. Writing for the Court, Justice Raymond A. Peters said forcing young people to travel in order to exercise the franchise would abridge their voting rights, and such people "would be isolated from political activity if they are not permitted to vote where they live."

Bill to Extend Legislators' Terms Passes Senate Committee

A proposed constitutional amendment to extend assemblymen's terms from two to four years and senators' terms from four to six years is heading for its final vote following approval by the Senate Governmental Organization Committee. If approved by the Legislature, this year's measure will be before the voters in November, 1972. The change in terms for Assemblymen and Senators will be considered as separate propositions so that either, or both, may take effect if approved by a majority vote. The method of providing staggered terms is to be prescribed by statute.

A voice vote in the committee sent the measure, authored by Assemblyman Harvey Johnson, to the full Senate. A similar proposal to lengthen the time between legislative elections was defeated by the voters in 1960.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CALIFORNIA CALENDAR

Meetings of the following state boards and commissions are listed each month; if one of these boards is not listed, it can be assumed that it is not scheduled to meet this month. Boards and commissions to be included are: Board of Corrections; Trustees of the California State Colleges; California Community Colleges Board of Governors; Coordinating Council for Higher Education; Board of Education; Highway Commission; Little Hoover Commission; Commission on Housing and Community Development; Lands Commission; Park and Recreation Commission; University of California Board of Regents; and Social Welfare Board.

Sept. 9-10 **State Board of Education.** Main Floor Auditorium, State Resources Building, 1416 9th Street, Sacramento. 9:00 a.m.

Sept. 9-11 **California Law Revision Commission.** State Bar Building, 1230 West Third Street, Los Angeles. 9/9 — 7:00 p.m.; 9/10 — 9:00 a.m.; 9/11 — 9:00 a.m.

Sept. 10 **Board of Corrections.** State Office Building One, Rm. 200, Sacramento.

Sept. 15-16 **Board of Governors, Community Colleges.** Airport Marina, 8601 Lincoln Blvd., Los Angeles.

Sept. 16-17 **California Highway Commission.** Board of Supervisors Hearing Room, Ventura County Courthouse, 501 Poli Street, Ventura. 9/16 — 9:30 a.m.; 9/17 — 9:00 a.m.

Sept. 17 **State Teachers Retirement System.** Main Floor Auditorium, State Resources Building, 1416 - 9th Street, Sacramento. 9:00 a.m.

State Parks and Recreation Commission. Angelo's Hall, Columbia State Historic Park, Columbia, Tuolumne County.

Sept. 17-18 **Board of Regents, University of California.** University Extension Center, 55 Laguna St., San Francisco.

Sept. 21-22 **Board of Trustees, California State Colleges.** Third Floor Auditorium, Office of the Chancellor, 5670 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles. 9:00 a.m.

Sept. 23-24 **Social Welfare Board.** 9/23 — Del Webb's Townehouse, San Francisco. 7:30 p.m.; 9/24 — State Building, Rm. 194, San Francisco, 9:00 a.m.

Sept. 30 **State Lands Commission.** State Capitol. 9:00 a.m.

Oct. 4 **Coordinating Council for Higher Education.** Host Hotel, Camellia Rm., Sacramento Metropolitan Airport. 9:00 a.m.

The following boards and commissions follow a standard monthly schedule and thus are not included in the Calendar: Board of Agriculture, first Thursday of each month; Allocation Board, second Tuesday; San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, first and third Thursdays; Merit Award Board, second Wednesday; Public Works Board, last Monday; Reclamation Board, second and fourth Fridays; Soil Conservation Commission, fourth Tuesday; Transportation Board, first Thursday; California Water Commission, first Friday; and Water Resources Control Board, first and third Thursdays. Please contact the agency for meeting time and place.

PEOPLE IN THE NEWS

APPOINTED

Virginia L. Carlson, 46, chief of Patton State Hospital's women's narcotics unit, as Superintendent of the California Institution for Women at Frontera by Governor Reagan.

Jiro J. Enomoto, 45, and **Bertram S. Griggs,** 50, as the first oriental and the first black state prison chiefs by Governor Reagan. Enomoto, Deputy Superintendent of Correctional Training Facilities at Soledad, was appointed Superintendent of the California Correctional Institution at Tehachapi. Griggs, Department of Corrections Parole Division administrator, became warden of the California Institution for Men at Chino.

Sigurd Hansen, 51, Deputy Director of the Department of Human Resources Development, as Director of the department by Governor Reagan.

Robert B. Hawkins Jr., 30, Deputy Director of the State Office of Economic Opportunity, as OEO Director by Governor Reagan.

Roger W. Heyns, 52, former Chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley for five years, as President of the American Council on Education.

William J. Kurtz, 49, Fiscal and Management Services chief in the Department of Public Health, as Chief Deputy Director of the department by Director Louis F. Saylor.

Dr. William D. McElroy, 54, Director of the National Science Foundation, as Chancellor of the University of California at San Diego by the UC Board of Regents.

Dr. James M. Stubblebine, 50, community mental health services chief in the San Francisco Department of Public Health, as Director of the Department of Mental Hygiene by Governor Reagan.

Lewis K. Uhler, 37, Director of the State Office of Economic Opportunity, as Assistant Secretary of the State Human Relations Agency by Secretary of the agency James M. Hall.

Brian R. Van Camp, 30, Acting Secretary of the Business and Transportation Agency, as Commissioner of Corporations by Governor Reagan.

Frank K. Walton, 51, president of a Los Angeles manufacturing firm, as Secretary of the Business and Transportaion Agency by Governor Reagan.

ELECTED

David A. Roberti, 32, Democratic assemblyman from the 48th District in Los Angeles, to the 27th District State Senate seat, beating Republican Bill Brophy by a vote of 35,998 to 23, 790. Roberti becomes the youngest member of the Senate and gives Democrats a 21-19 edge.

FIRED

J. Jamison Moore, 43, member of the California Advisory Commission on Marine and Coastal Resources and the Navigation and Ocean Development Commission, by Governor Reagan. Moore accepted $22,500 from a Los Angeles land development alliance for writing a report opposing coastal zone controls.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Selected State Government Reports

BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT

Summary of Employment and Unemployment in California 1950-1971. Dept. of Human Resources Development, Research and Statistics Division, P.O. Box 923, San Francisco 94101. July, 1971. 13 pages.

Second Annual Report on the California Job Development Corporation Law and Small Business Assistance Program. California Job Development Corporation Law Executive Board, 1120 N St., Sacramento 95814. July, 1971. 35 pages.

Regulatory Crisis: Examination into the Operations and Policies of the Public Utilities Commission. Senate Public Utilities and Corporations Committee. June, 1971. 63 pages.

Hearing on Staff Rotation Plan and Proposed Changes in Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public Utilities Commission. Assembly Committee on Commerce and Public Utilities, edited transcript. March, 1971. 149 pages. Final report isued April, 1971. 39 pages.

ENVIRONMENT

Governor's Progess Report on the Development of State Environmental Goals and Policy. Office of Planning and Research, 1400 10th St., Sacramento 95814. June, 1971. 24 pages.

Proposed Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of Environmental Impact Statements Under California Environmental Quality Act of 1970. Office of Secretary for Resources, 1416 9th St., Sacramento 95814. June, 1971. 22 pages.

The Technology of Solid Waste Management: Implications for State Policy. Assembly Science and Technology Advisory Council, Assembly Office of Research. July, 1971. 38 pages.

Meeting the Electrical Energy Requirements for California. Assembly Science and Technology Advisory Council. June, 1971. 15 pages. Role of state government in state's electrical power demands.

Technical and Economic Feasibility of Non-Coastal Power Plant Siting in California. Assembly Science and Technology Advisory Council. June, 1971. 42 pages.

Vehicle Emission Inspection. Air Resources Board, 1108 14th St., Sacramento 95814. July, 1971. 24 pages. Cost and effectiveness of vehicle emission inspection programs.

12th Conference: Methods in Air Pollution and Industrial Hygiene Studies. University of Southern California, Los Angeles. April, 1971. Technical papers on source testing for particulate matter and motor vehicles, emission inventories, effects of automobile exhaust, etc.

Summary of Selected Legislation Relating to Natural Resources and Wildlife Before the California Legislature. Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Wildlife. June, 1971. 171 pages. A compendium of 1971 environmental legislation.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Fourth Annual Report on the Implementation of the California Therapeutic Abortion Act. Dept. of Public Health, Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, 2151 Berkeley Way, Berkeley 94704. June, 1971. 6 pages.

The Statewide Medi-Cal Conflict of Interest Study. Larry D. Munyon, Dept. of Health Care Services, 714 P St., Sacramento 95814. April, 1971. 21 pages. $1.05.

The Medi-Cal Reform Plan, Dept. of Health Care Services. 714 P St., Sacramento 95814. April, 1971. 17 pages. Supplement to above, 15 pages.

California Task Force Report on Venereal Disease Control. State Board of Public Health, 2151 Berkeley Way, Berkeley 94704. June, 1971. 8 pages.

Report to the Legislature on the Manufacture of Methamphetamine and Other Restricted Dangerous Drugs. Dept. of Public Health, 2151 Berkeley Way, Berkeley 94704. April, 1971. 23 pages.

Brief Review of Some Aspects of the Funding Program in California Vocational Education. Calif. Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training, 1500 5th St., Sacramento 95814. 1971. 11 pages.

Regional Occupational Centers and Programs. Dept. of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento 95814. July, 1971. 26 pages. Status report on centers and programs in operation throughout the state.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND TAXATION

History of Legislative Action on Items Vetoed by the Governor. Office of the Legislative Analyst. July, 1971. 39 pages. Fiscal analysis of Governor's 1971-72 budget vetoes.

Tax Reform, 1971. Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation, July 21, 1971. 17 pages. Detailed explanation of Assembly Democratic tax reform package.

California State Bonds. State Treasurer's Office. February, 1971. 65 pages. Summary of state bond programs and bonded indebtedness.

State Subventions to Local Governments in California. Office of the Legislative Analyst. June, 1971. 130 pages. Analysis of state grants and loans for the support of local governments.

MISCELLANEOUS

Organization Chart of the Executive Branch of California State Government. Office of the Governor. August, 1971. 11″ x 17″.

Task Force Report on Legalized Gambling. Office of the Attorney General, Dept. of Justice, 600 State Bldg., Los Angeles 90012. June, 1971. 60 pages.

One Man, Less Than One Vote: How Certain Methods of Electing City Councilmen Result in Significant Under-Representation of Minorities in Major California Cities. Senate Majority Caucus, Senator Mervyn Dymally, Chairman. June, 1971. 45 pages.

Unless otherwise indicated, reports may be obtained by writing the appropriate committee or agency, c/o State Capitol, Sacramento, California 95814. Orders payable by check or money order only.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOTING RECORDS

Listed below are the votes of Senators and Assemblymen on the major roll calls in the Legislature through this month and a brief summary of the issues under consideration. Votes selected for inclusion are on issues of major importance to Californians as a whole or issues on which there is a major division of opinion, or both.

Y—Yes

N—No

*—Absent or Not Voting

⅔ vote required for urgency measures, constitutional amendments, appropriation bills.

Assembly: 41 votes required for passage of bills requiring majority vote. ⅔ = 54 votes.

Senate: 21 votes required for passage of bills requiring majority vote. ⅔ = 27 votes.

SENATE

July 2nd to 8th

SB 576 (Gregorio) — Allows 18-year-olds to hold public office. Passed 26-4.

SB 434 (Gregorio) — Prohibits the construction of any toll bridge or highway crossing across the San Francisco Bay. Passed 22-8.

SB 1516 (Moscone) — Allows granting of probation without district attorney's approval in unusual cases in which interests of justice would best be served. Passed 21-13.

SB 1146 (Moscone) — Prohibits the asexualization of prisoners who are recidivists. Passed 25-6.

SB 1408 (Lagomarsino) — Voids use of a lottery system in determining teacher layoffs. Passed 22-8.

July 9th to 15th

SB 112 (Richardson) — Provides that murder of a police officer engaged in the performance of his duty is first-degree murder. Passed 25-7.

SB 150 (Dymally) — Repeals requirement that all proceedings at polls must be conducted in English. Override of Governor's veto failed 17-18.

July 15th to 22nd

SB 97 (Song) — Requires credit card issuer to correct billing errors within 60 days of being informed by cardholder. Revises credit card practices and prohibits discrimination in the issuance of credit cards on the basis of race, sex, and other grounds. Passed 26-2.

SB 1596 (Rodda) — Authorizes permissive school tax override for preschool child nutrition programs for 1970-71 fiscal year. Passed 23-9.

SB 857 (Petris) — Prohibits landlord from terminating tenant's utility service in order to evict tenant. Passed 21-8.

SB 796 (Beilenson) — Welfare reform bill. (See page 194). Passed 21-13.

SB 325 (Mills))— Authorizes counties to impose sales and use taxes at the rate of 1¼ percent rather than 1 percent and to use revenues for public transportation systems. Decreases state sales and use tax rate from 4 to 3¾ percent. Passed 22-13.

July 23rd to 29th

SCA 53 (Zenovich) — Would tax banks in the same manner as corporations are taxed. Requires approval of voters in 1972. Failed 16-15.

SB 1387 (Dills) — Lowers age of consent for marriage for males to 18. Passed 21-5.

SB 861 (Petris) — Provides for tenant representation on housing authorities, requires written statement of reasonable cause of eviction before housing authority can evict tenant, and prohibits housing authority from entering tenant's premises except in emergency situation. Passed 21-8.

SB 490 (Moscone) — Permits person to bring suit for public nuisance injurious to the environment. Passed 21-16.

SB 1207 (Alquist) — Requires public utilities subject to jurisdiction of

SENATE

Republicans 19	SB 576	SB 434	SB 1516	SB 1146	SB 1408	SB 112	SB 150	SB 97	SB 1596	SB 857	SB 796 (A)	SB 325	SCA 53	SB 1387	SB 861	SB 490	SB 1207	SCA 42	SB 37	SB 24	SB 1396	SB 1420	SB 782	SB 107	SB 1633	SB 698	SB 796 (B)	AB 949
Behr	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bradley	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Burgener	*	Y	N	Y	*	Y	N	Y	*	*	N	Y	*	N	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carpenter	*	*	*	*	*	Y	N	*	N	N	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cologne	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	*	*	N	*	*	*	N	N	Y	N	*	*	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Coombs	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	*	*	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cusanovich	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	*	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Deukmejian	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	*	*	*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grunsky	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Harmer	*	*	N	N	Y	Y	N	*	*	*	N	N	*	*	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	*	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lagomarsino	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marks	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marler	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Nejedly	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	*	*	N	N	*	*	Y	Y	N	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Richardson	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Schrade	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Stevens	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	*	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Way	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	N	Y	*	*	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	N
Whetmore	N	Y	N	N	Y	*	*	*	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

Democrats 21	SB 576	SB 434	SB 1516	SB 1146	SB 1408	SB 112	SB 150	SB 97	SB 1596	SB 857	SB 796 (A)	SB 325	SCA 53	SB 1387	SB 861	SB 490	SB 1207	SCA 42	SB 37	SB 24	SB 1396	SB 1420	SB 782	SB 107	SB 1633	SB 698	SB 796 (B)	AB 949
Alquist	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Beilenson	*	Y	Y	*	*	N	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	N	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y
Carrell	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Collier	Y	N	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dills	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Dymally	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Gregorio	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Holmdahl	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kennick	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mills	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Moscone	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Petris	Y	*	*	*	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Roberti																Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N			
Rodda	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Short	*	*	Y	*	N	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	*	*	*	*	N	N
Song	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Stiern	*	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Teale	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	*	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	N	N
Walsh	*	N	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	N	N	Y	*	*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Wedworth	Y	*	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	*	Y	*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Zenovich	*	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Public Utilities Commission to provide equal employment opportunities at all job levels without discrimination on the basis of race, sex, and other grounds. Passed 21-17.

SCA 42 (Cologne) — Would allow defendant in criminal case to defend himself in person. To be submitted to a vote of the people in 1972. Passed 27-13.

July 30th to August 4th

SB 37 (Harmer) — Establishes drug courts at superior court level to have jurisdiction over juveniles who commit dangerous drug, narcotics, and marijuana offenses. Passed 22-12.

SB 24 (Dymally) — Creates Office of State Public Defender to represent persons not financially able to employ counsel in post-conviction proceedings. Passed 25-5.

SB 1396 (Way) — Requires fluoride treatments for pupils in public and private elementary and secondary schools. Passed 24-4.

SB 1420 (Zenovich) — Establishes requirements for the selection of persons 18 years of age and older for grand juries. Passed 21-13.

SB 782 (Alquist) — Revises the allocation of money to northern and southern counties from the State Highway Fund for the construction of state highways. Passed 22-14.

SB 107 (Behr) — Designates portions of the Klamath, Trinity, and Eel River basins and adjacent lands as wild and scenic rivers. Failed 19-17.

August 6th to 12th

SB 1633 (Marler) — Requires reimbursement of counties for costs incurred in the conduct of criminal trials. Passed 27-10.

SB 698 (Marks) — Appropriates up to $2,472,546 for state college and up to $1,150,000 for community college educational opportunity programs. Passed 28-9.

SB 796 (Beilenson) — Welfare reform bill (See page 194). Concurrence in Assembly amendments, 31-8.

AB 949 (Campbell) — Medi-Cal reform bill (See page 194). Passed 28-11.

ASSEMBLY

July 2nd to 8th

AB 2710 (Sieroty) — Requires all Adult Authority rules and regulations to be public information. Passed 45-14.

AB 2709 (Sieroty) — Requires all Department of Corrections rules and regulations to be public information. Passed 41-28.

July 9th to 15th

AB 1526 (Moretti) — Prohibits oil and gas extraction in the Santa Barbara Channel after April 1, 1972. Passed 51-6.

AB 2688 (Crown) — Establishes optional minimum standards of compensation, retirement allowances, and fringe benefits for peace officers for the purpose of raising the level of competence of local law enforcement officers. Provides for grants to local governments in order to provide attractive benefits. Passed 47-16.

AB 2116 (Cory) — Requires disclosure by certain public officers and candidates for public office of their investments in excess of $10,000 which are subject to regulation of the public agency of which they are officers. Passed 51-14.

AB 878 (Dunlap) — Gives additional powers to local human relations commissions and authorizes working agreements between such commissions and the Fair Employment Practice Commission relative to jurisdiction over discrimination in housing and employment. Passed 42-23.

AB 2274 (Ralph) — Requires persons who lease real property used exclusively for residential purposes to give 60 days' notice instead of 30 days' notice of termination of tenancy. Passed 41-28.

AB 1278 (Waxman) Revises voter qualifications to lower voting age to 18, permit persons to register to vote upon reaching age 17, reduce state, county, and precinct residency to 30 days for all three, and reduce waiting period for naturalized citizens to vote to 30 days. Passed 41-26.

AB 1230 (Waxman) — Allows credit of up to $8 and $16 for political contributions for married persons filing a joint income tax return and deletes $100 deduction for such contributions. Passed 41-28.

AB 1619 (Vasconcellos) — Authorizes creation of a joint cities-county environmental council within each county to deal with problems of population growth, economic development, and urbanization. Passed 41-27.

July 15th to 22nd

AB 2711 (Sieroty) — Allows person to present claim in maximum amount of $10,000 per year for each year he has been imprisoned erroneously due to miscarriage of justice. Passed 42-28.

AB 2923 (Chacon) — Increases minimum salaries effective July 1, 1972 for a full-time teacher with bachelor's degree from $6,000 to $6,800 and requires school districts to pay additional compensation or grant released time for services performed outside of teaching regular classes. Passed 41-29.

AB 3072 (Quimby) — Requires full disclosure of composition of jewelry including watches sold by retailer and makes unlawful certain practices relating to the sale and appraisal of jewelry. Passed 41-12.

AB 144 (Leroy Greene) — Major school finance bill. Raises approximately $250 million for state school support. Passed 41-0 (all Republicans abstained from voting).

AB 2973 (Miller) — Provides that a felony not punishable by an existing law shall be punishable by imprisonment in state prison for not more than 5 years, a fine of $5,000, or both, or imprisonment in county jail for not more than one year, a fine of $1,000, or both. Failed 8-37.

ACA 63 (Cline) — Permits minors 18 to 21 to buy and consume alcoholic beverages. To be submitted to a vote of the people in 1972. Passed 59-10.

ACA 44 (Gonsalves) — Would prohibit the taxation of single-family homes located in areas zoned for such purposes at a greater value than a home site. To be submitted to a vote of the people in 1972. Passed 59-15.

ACA 22 (Harvey Johnson) — Changes terms of state senators from 4 to 6 years and terms of state assemblymen from 2 to 4 years. To be submitted to a vote of the people in 1972. Passed 54-17.

ACA 45 (Hayes) — Creates a single state-funded trial court system by merging municipal and justice courts with superior courts. Creates position of Superior Court Marshal whose office shall perform legal services now performed by county sheriffs and marshals. Passed 54-19.

(Continued on next page)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AB 949 (Campbell) — Medi-Cal reform bill. Passed 66-10.

July 23rd to 29th

AB 2590 (Vasconcellos) — Requires State Board of Education to make basic and supplemental textbooks available to non-public elementary school pupils free of charge. Passed 52-13.

AB 1056 (Z'berg) — Creates the State Environmental Quality Board and regional boards to regulate all statewide environmental functions, including air and water pollution, solid waste management, coastal resources preservation, land use and planning, thermal and noise pollution. Passed 46-26.

AB 3022 (Sieroty) — Revises provisions relating to freedom from contempt for news media personnel for disclosure of information. Passed 50-12.

AB 1505 (Fenton) — Establishes system of mandatory, no-fault basic loss motor vehicle insurance. Passed 45-29.

AB 1181 (Murphy) — Creates the Office of Ombudsman for Corrections to handle complaints, conduct investigations, and make findings regarding conditions in correctional institutions throughout the state. Passed 43-26.

AB 2703 (Sieroty) — Provides that revocation of parole of convicted person shall be on the basis of a violation of an express written condition of parole. Failed 17-41.

AB 2904 (Dunlap) — Prohibits isolation or segregation of prisoners unless approved by a prison hearing committee. Further prohibits confinement in isolation for more than 10 days in any six-month period. Passed 42-32.

ACA 16 (Foran) — Would allow the use of gas tax revenues for air pollution control and the development of public mass transit if approved by the voters at 1972 election. Passed 64-9.

AB 2752 (Bagley) — Would allow person arrested for criminal offense to be released on his own recognizance pending appearance in court. Passed 43-20.

AB 1226 (Waxman) — Would permit voter registration to continue up to the 20th day before an election. Passed 41-36.

AB 1888 (Badham) — Authorizes female employees to work four-day workweek consisting of 40 hours if employee is compensated for any overtime worked in excess of 40 hours. Failed 32-41.

AB 2063 (Karabian) — Would permit conjugal visits of 48 hours, three times per year, for state prisoners. Failed 22-54.

AB 528 (Arnett) — Provides that no employer shall knowingly employ an alien who is not entitled to lawful residence in the U.S. Passed 55-8.

AB 566 (Brown) — Establishes minimum wage of $1.85 per hour effective January 1, 1972 and $2.00 per hour effective January 1, 1973. Passed 42-31.

AB 2640 (Ralph) — Requires advertisement for consumer goods to show price in cents, if over $1.00, in figures at least one-half the same size as the dollar figure unless actual price is in whole dollars. Passed 44-23.

AB 3066 (Z'berg) — Provides for the submission to voters at 1972 general election of $250 million bond issue for the acquisition of parks, beaches, and recreational facilities. Passed 66-4.

AB 1565 (Sieroty) — Appropriates $5 million for the construction of children's centers. Passed 49-20.

AB 429 (Quimby) — Requires public agencies to insure and provide for the liability of peace officers employed by public agencies. Failed 14-42.

AB 395 (Dunlap) — Requires cities and counties to investigate conditions relating to land access to navigable waters prior to the issuance of a building permit or approval of a subdivision or zoning variance for land in question. Failed 26-43.

AB 1772 (Miller) — Would eliminate welfare exemption from property taxation and certain inheritance and gift tax exemptions for organizations excluding persons from their membership on the basis of race, color, or national ancestry. Failed 33-36.

AB 515 (Knox) — Establishes regional environmental planning councils to develop long-term plans for the conservation and development of a region's resources. Passed 47-20.

July 30th to August 4th

AB 2961 (Meade) — Establishes minimum health and safety and inmate treatment standards for city and county jails. Passed 51-18.

AB 2989 (McCarthy) — Permits otherwise qualifed alien to receive public assistance if he certifies that he is in country legally and is entitled to remain indefinitely. Passed 56-14.

ACA 39 (Ralph) — Repeals constitutional prohibition against the development of any low-cost housing project until a majority of a city's or county's qualified voters approve. To be submitted to a vote of the people in 1972. Failed 35-33.

AB 1547 (Sieroty) — Extends protective labor laws to men and requires annual automatic cost-of-living increases in minimum wage. Failed 35-40.

AB 2296 (Warren) — Requires person conducting mail order business in state by advertisement to mail goods within six weeks of receipt of order. Passed 45-24.

AB 490 (Roberti) — Prohibits the use of professional strikebreakers by employers during a strike or lockout at any place of business in the state. Motion to refer for further study *(i.e.,* to defeat bill) adopted 41-36.

AB 2964 (Meade) — Extends Rumford Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex. Passed 42-26.

AB 2012 (Waxman) — Establishes rights and remedies relative to repossession of consumer goods. Passed 41-27.

AB 562 (Vasconcellos) — Appropriates $5,020,000 for methadone maintenance programs. Passed 57-19.

SB 59 (Rodda) — Eliminates possibility that only one violation of sex education regulations shall be grounds for suspension or dismissal of teacher. Failed 27-37.

AB 378 (Z'berg) — Provides that state employees replacing local agency employees shall receive their regular rate of state compensation or the rate of compensation paid local agency employees, whichever is higher. Override of Governor's veto failed 35-27.

August 6th to 12th

SB 1596 (Rodda) — Authorizes permissive school tax override for child nutrition programs. Passed 44-10.

SB 796 (Beilenson) — Welfare reform bill. Passed 62-9. (See page 194).

AB 949 (Campbell) — Medi-Cal reform bill. Concurrence in Senate amendments, 56-13.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ASSEMBLY

Democrats

	AB 2710	AB 2709	AB 1526	AB 2688	AB 2116	AB 878	AB 2274	AB 1278	AB 1230	AB 1619	AB 2711	AB 2923	AB 3072	AB 144	AB 2973	ACA 63	ACA 44	ACA 22	ACA 45	AB 949 (A)	AB 2590	AB 1056	AB 3022	AB 1505	AB 1181	AB 2703	AB 2904	ACA 16	AB 2752	AB 1226	AB 1888	AB 2063	AB 528	AB 566	AB 2640	AB 3066	AB 1565	AB 429	AB 395	AB 1772	AB 515	AB 2961	AB 2989	ACA 39	AB 1547	AB 2296	AB 490	AB 2964	AB 2012	AB 562	SB 59	AB 378	SB 1596	SB 796	AB 949 (B)
Bee	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	*
Brathwaite	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	N
Brown	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Burton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	*	Y	*	Y	*	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	N
Chacon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cory	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*
Crown	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Cullen	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Davis	N	N	Y	Y	Y	*	N	N	N	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y
Deddeh	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dunlap	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	*	*
Fenton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Fong	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Foran	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Garcia	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	*	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gonsalves	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	N	*	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y
Greene, B.	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Greene, L.	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Johnson, H.	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	*	N	N	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N	*	Y	Y	Y
Karabian	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Keysor	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y
Knox	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	N	*	Y	*
LaCosta	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
MacDonald	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	*	*
McAlister	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
McCarthy	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Meade	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y
Miller	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	N	N
Moretti	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	*	*	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y
Pierson	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y
Porter	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Powers	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Quimby	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	Y
Ralph	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	N	N
Roberti	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	*	*	Y																		
Ryan	Y	Y	*	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	N
Sieroty	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Thomas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Townsend	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	N	*	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	*	*	N	Y	*	*	Y	*
Vasconcellos	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Warren	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*
Waxman	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Z'berg	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N

Republicans

	AB 2710	AB 2709	AB 1526	AB 2688	AB 2116	AB 878	AB 2274	AB 1278	AB 1230	AB 1619	AB 2711	AB 2923	AB 3072	AB 144	AB 2973	ACA 63	ACA 44	ACA 22	ACA 45	AB 949 (A)	AB 2590	AB 1056	AB 3022	AB 1505	AB 1181	AB 2703	AB 2904	ACA 16	AB 2752	AB 1226	AB 1888	AB 2063	AB 528	AB 566	AB 2640	AB 3066	AB 1565	AB 429	AB 395	AB 1772	AB 515	AB 2961	AB 2989	ACA 39	AB 1547	AB 2296	AB 490	AB 2964	AB 2012	AB 562	SB 59	AB 378	SB 1596	SB 796	AB 949 (B)
Arnett	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	*	*	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Badham	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	*	*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	*	*	N	Y	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	*	N	Y
Bagley	Y	Y	*	*	*	Y	*	*	Y	Y	*	*	Y	*	*	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	*	Y	Y	N	*	Y	Y	N	*	Y	*	Y	Y	*	*	*	Y	Y	*	Y	N	*	Y	Y
Barnes	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N	*	Y	*	*	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	*	N	N	N	*	N	N	Y	*	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	*	*	Y	Y
Belotti	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	*	*	N	Y	*	*	N	Y	*	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	*	N	*	N	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	Y	Y
Beverly	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	*	Y	N	N	*	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	*	Y	*	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Biddle	Y	N	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N	*	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	*	N	N	Y	*	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	*	*	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	Y	Y
Briggs	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	*	Y	*	N	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Burke	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Campbell	N	N	Y	*	*	*	N	Y	N	N	N	*	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N	*	Y	N	*	N	Y	N	*	Y	Y	N	N	*	N	Y	*	*	N	N	Y	*	*	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y
Chappie	*	*	Y	*	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	*	*	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	*	N	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	*	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	*	Y	N	N	*	Y	N
Cline	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	*	N	Y	N	N	*	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	*	Y	N	N	N	*	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Collier	*	N	N	*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	*	N	N	*	N	N	N	*	N	N	Y	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
Conrad	N	N	*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Dent	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	*	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Duffy	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	*	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	*	N	*	N	N	*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Hayden	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	*	*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y
Hayes	Y	N	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N	Y	*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	*	*	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	*	Y	N	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Johnson, R.	*	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ketchum	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	*	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	*	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	*
Lanterman	Y	N	Y	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	*	N	*	*	N	*	*	N	*	N	N	N	*	N	N	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lewis	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MacGillivray	N	N	Y	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	*	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	*	N	N	N	Y	*	N	N	N	Y	*
Maddy	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	*	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	N	*	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	*	Y	Y
Mobley	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	*	Y	*	*	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y
Monagan	*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	Y	*	*	Y	*	*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	*	*	N	N	N	Y	*	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	*	Y	Y	Y
Moorhead	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Murphy	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	*	N	N	*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Priolo	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	N	Y	N	*	N	N	Y	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Russell	*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	*	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	*	N	N	Y	*	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	*	N	Y	Y
Schabarum	Y	N	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N	*	N	*	*	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	*	N	N	Y	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	*	*	*	N	N	*	Y	N	N	N	N	*	N	Y
Seeley	N	N	Y	N	*	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	*	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	*	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Stacey	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	*	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	*	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	Y	N	N	N	N	*	N	*	N	Y
Stull	*	N	*	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	Y	*	*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	*	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Wakefield	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	*	*	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilson	Y	*	*	*	Y	*	N	*	*	Y	Y	Y	*	*	N	Y	Y	N	*	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Y	*	*	Y	*	N	Y	N	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Y	*	Y	*	Y	*	N	*	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wood	*	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	*	*	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	*	Y	Y	N	N	Y	*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sometime somebody has to start to change things, start to say something, do something, be politically expendable.

—Shirley Chisholm

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED